DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 742 SO 016 555

AUTHOR	McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin; Thomas, Margaret A.
TITLE	Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production. An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts. Volume I: Comparing the Process of Change across Districts.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Getty Center for Education in the Arts, Los Angeles, CA.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-8330-0617-7
PUB DATE	Dec 84
NOTE	84p.; For volumes II and III, see SO 016 556-557. For related document, see SO 016 497.
AVAILABLE FROM	Rand Corporation, 1700 Main St., P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90406-2138 (Order No. R-3161/1-JPG, $7.50).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Aesthetic Education; Art Appreciation; *Art Education; Art History; Case Studies; Comparative Analysis; Educational Change; Educational Needs; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Visual Arts
IDENTIFIERS	Art Criticism

ABSTRACT

This volume reports the findings from a cross-site analysis of seven school districts that were implementing a discipline-based approach to visual arts education. A discipline-based approach incorporates four art disciplines in the classroom: art history, art criticism, aesthetics, and art making. The study focused on two major areas: (1) factors generating support for a strong substantive art education program in a district's curriculum, and (2) factors influencing the willingness and ability of school districts and teachers to carry out and maintain a discipline-based art education program. This volume identifies the commonalities across research sites and compares the process of change in the seven selected school districts. It discusses factors associated with sustaining quality art education programs in view of declining student enrollments, shrinking school budgets, and emphasis on basic reading and computational skills. Six chapters detail the premise and purpose of the study, the study design, initiation, implementation, institutionalization, and conclusions. The study's findings affirm that discipline-based art education theory has found its way into school practice. Although the forms of application vary from district to district, most of the criteria that define this approach to art education are universally present: attention to productive, historical, and critical areas of art learning; a written curriculum; sequential and cumulative instruction; and the use of adult work as exemplary. (LH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Tom Lockrell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED257742

Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production

An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts

Volume I: Comparing the Process of Change Across Districts

Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, Margaret A. Thomas,

SP 016 555

Rand

The research described in this report was sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, an operating entity of the J. Paul Getty Trust.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
(Revised for volume 1)
Main entry under title:

Art history, art criticism, and art production.

"Prepared for the J. Paul Getty Trust."
"R-3161/1-JPG"-"R-3161/3-JPG."
Contents: v. 1. Comparing the process of change across districts / Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin and Margaret A. Thomas — v. 2. Case studies of seven selected sites / Michael Day, et al. — v. 3. Executive summary / Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, Margaret A. Thomas, Joyce Peterson.
1. Art—Study and teaching (Elementary)—United States —Case studies. 2. Art—Study and teaching (Secondary)— United States—Case studies. I. McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin, 1941- . II. Thomas, Margaret A., 1945- III. Day, Michael, 1938- . IV. Rand Corporation.
N353.A76 1984 707'.1273 84-17996
ISBN 0-8330-0617-7 (v. 1)
ISBN 0-8330-0600-2 (v. 2)
ISBN 0-8330-0607-X (v. 3)

The Rand Publications Series: The Report is the principal publication documenting and transmitting Rand's major research findings and final research results. The Rand Note reports other outputs of sponsored research for general distribution. Publications of The Rand Corporation do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the sponsors of Rand research.

Published by The Rand Corporation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

R-3161/1-JPG

Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production

An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Volume I: Comparing the Process of Change Across Districts

Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, Margaret A. Thomas
With contributions from:
Susan Reese Bell, The Rand Corporation
Michael Day, Brigham Young University
Elliot Eisner, Stanford University
Robert Stake, University of Illinois
Brent Wilson, Pennsylvania State University
Marjorie Wilson, Art Education Consultant

December 1984

Prepared for the Getty Center for Education in the Arts of the J. Paul Getty Trust

Rand
1700 MAIN STREET
P.O. BOX 2138
SANTA MONICA, CA 90406-2138

FOREWORD

This report is the result of a search for school districts that are developing art education programs that include art production, art history, and art criticism. It is sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, an operating entity of the J. Paul Getty Trust. The research was encouraged because the Getty Center believes that if art education is ever to become a meaningful part of the curriculum, it must broaden its content and become more rigorous.

The study is composed of three volumes. Volume I identifies the commonalities across research sites and compares the process of change in seven selected districts. It discusses factors associated with sustaining quality art education programs in view of declining student enrollments, shrinking school budgets, and emphasis on basic reading and computational skills.

Volume II contains individual case studies. Each study illuminates the characteristics of the art program as well as the personalities that have shaped it. Each is enriched by the research approach and writing style of its author. Volume III summarizes the study.

This case study research project has its genesis in the Getty Trust's commitment to improving art history scholarship, conservation of art objects, and art and museum education. As a private operating foundation, the Trust is primarily responsible for developing and administering programs that meet these objectives.[1] The Trust has manifested its commitment to art education through the creation of its Center for Education in the Arts.

The philosophy of the Getty Center is the belief that no child is fully educated or adequately prepared to live in an increasingly technological world without understanding the meaning and beauty transmitted by the arts. The Center is not alone in this belief. Several recent national studies on education share some of its concerns.[2] Two nationally recognized educators, Dr. Ernest Boyer and Dr. Elliot W. Eisner, whose rationales for arts education introduce this report, support this philosophy and encourage arts efforts.

The Center's establishment followed a year-long examination of the substance and quality of public school arts education programs, particularly those in the visual arts. Before developing its own program, the Getty wanted to better understand why arts education is accorded such low status in most of the nation's schools. This review was useful in identifying many of the features characterizing arts education content and practice. Chief among these is the traditional emphasis in visual arts education on fostering creative expression and developing artistic skills, such as drawing, painting, and sculpting. This approach is evidenced in programs that stress hands-on production activities to the virtual exclusion of teaching children about the cultural and historical contributions of art or how to value, analyze, and interpret works of art.

Other salient findings included:

---

[1]In addition to the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, the Trust's other operating activities include The J. Paul Getty Museum; the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities; the Getty Conservation Institute; the Art History Information Program; the Metropolitan Museum/Getty Program of Art on Film and the Museum Management Institute.

[2]Mortimer Adler, *The Paidea Proposal: An Educational Manifesto*, Macmillan, New York, 1982. Ernest Boyer, *High School: An Agenda for Action*, Harper & Row, New York, 1983. The College Board. *Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know*, New York, 1983. John Goodlad, *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1983. National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., 1983.

- Lack of recognition among many school policymakers and parents of the cognitive and affective contributions the arts make to educational development;
- College admission criteria, teacher certification requirements, standardized testing, and high school graduation requirements, which consistently exclude the arts, thereby reinforcing the notion that the arts are not valuable to educational development or worthy of instructional time in the curriculum;
- The absence of written, sequential, and substantive curricula that convey the content and processes of art and provide for cumulative learning.

After reviewing these findings and verifying them with leading art educators, the Getty concluded that if arts education is to move from the sidelines of instruction to a more central place in a balanced school curriculum, its content needed to be expanded to include attention to all the disciplines making up the arts: art production, art history, art criticism, and aesthetics.

The inclusion of these four content areas in art instruction is important because each develops knowledge and skills that contribute importantly not only to children's more complete understanding of art, but to their ability to draw facts and inferences about the cultural and historical contexts from which the arts spring and to analyze and interpret the powerful ideas that the arts communicate.

As adults we recognize that understanding of the arts is a composite of historical, critical, and technical information. It seems reasonable, then, to expect arts instruction to attend to all of these aspects. Yet, traditionally, this has not been the concept guiding such instruction in schools.

Education in the arts has emphasized affective development almost exclusively—imagination, feelings, and emotions. But when general education increasingly emphasizes cognitive development—thinking, ideas, reading, writing, and math—it becomes clear why arts education programs are often perceived as "frills" and marginally educational.

Since the mid-1960s a handful of visual arts educators have been calling for the approach to art education the Getty now advocates and embraces. This approach recently has been called "discipline-based" art because instruction is centered on the knowledge that constitutes the discipline of art. That knowledge not only consists of art making, illuminating artistic media, processes and techniques, but also incorporates content and skills drawn from the other areas that contribute to our understanding of art—art history, art criticism, and aesthetics.[3]

This comprehensive approach to visual art education is grounded in theory, but we also wanted to know whether any school districts in the country were practicing art education in this way. And if so, we wanted to know what we could learn from the classroom application of theory to practice. During the selection process we found individual schools and teachers who were teaching art from a discipline-based approach. But our objective was to study art programs being implemented on a district-wide basis in as many grade levels as possible to understand the variables that affect the development of a discipline-based program.

The Rand Corporation, a national research organization with extensive experience in analyzing educational change, was engaged to assist in the identification of school art programs that reflected a discipline-based approach. Rand researchers designed the study and completed

[3]The definition of discipline-based art education is still evolving. Since selecting the sites to be included in the study, the Center has added aesthetics to its definition of discipline-based art education. The case studies therefore do not address this content area, which is concerned with the nature and theory of art, as specifically as they do the art production, history, and criticism.

a cross-site analysis of these selected districts. The Getty invited five educators with research experience in arts education to write case studies about the selected sites.

The study had two important purposes. The first was to determine whether the approach to visual arts education adopted by the Getty was being practiced in school districts from kindergarten through twelfth grade. The second was to learn more about the character of these programs from an in-depth study of each. We wanted to know what commonalities these programs share; what makes each distinctive; what curricula, instructional, and evaluation methodologies guide these programs; what factors encourage and constrain them; how they are being implemented; how children are responding to them; and why, given the way in which art education traditionally is taught, these districts chose a different approach to art instruction.

The study's findings affirm that discipline-based art education theory has found its way into school practice. The forms of application vary from district to district, as might be expected. But most of the criteria that define this approach to art education are present in all—attention to productive, historical, and critical areas of art learning; a written curriculum; sequential and cumulative instruction; and the use of adult art works as exemplars.

All of the districts studied are considered to have promising programs, and most are well on their way to becoming exemplary models of discipline-based art education. All still are evolving and refining their programs, although some are further along in their development than others.

In determining what art education could be, the elements missing in these promising programs are as important as the elements that are present. These missing elements point out some important issues for the future practice of art education and the training of its practitioners. For example, as committed as the seven districts are to discipline-based art education, there is little evidence of adequate instruction in art history and criticism. Few are using curricula that can be viewed as exemplars leading to cumulative learning at each grade level. On the positive side, analyzing how these promising programs can be improved does not diminish their accomplishments. Given art education's traditional emphasis on art production activities, these districts stand out for their pioneering efforts.

As a group, the seven case studies provide rich and vivid accounts of how art specialists and general classroom teachers are practicing discipline-based art instruction. They demonstrate the importance of support from school board members, superintendents, and principals; of a written curriculum; and of in-service training. They illustrate an expanded role for the professional art specialist, which includes more responsibility for curriculum development, in-service leadership, technical assistance, and program evaluation. They provide examples of school-museum collaborations. And they dispel the notion that systematic instruction compromises or constrains individual creativity.

Originally the Getty Center undertook this study to inform its own program decisions. Because the Getty wants to be responsive to the many inquiries from educators and parents about the findings, the study is available publicly in three formats: the Rand cross-site analysis; the complete case studies; and a concise summary of important findings and issues.

This foreword would not be complete without special words of appreciation and recognition to all individuals in each school district—administrators, teachers, and students—who participated in the study and also to the members of the research team. The Getty Center is privileged and fortunate to have had the opportunity of working with them all.

The openness, cooperation, and enthusiasm of the school personnel in the seven districts was indispensable in providing thorough and accurate information about each program. Their personal and collective devotion to providing their students with a balanced education is commendable.

The researchers' analysis of the strengths as well as the shortcomings of each program is not only informative and instructive, but invaluable to the districts as they continue to perfect their programs. During the 18 months it took to complete their reports, they constructively criticized each other's work, responded to critiques of their drafts by professionals in the field of education and art education, and demonstrated the sensitivity of caring educators in working with school personnel.

Since the commencement of this study, several reports have been published on the character of American education. The issue of excellence in education has captured the national spotlight and raised our consciousness about our individual responsibilities in insuring quality education. Several of these studies have recognized the arts as basic to education. They have pointed out that if art education is to become a basic and essential subject in a balanced curriculum, its instructional content will have to become more substantive and rigorous. The art programs included in this study have become "basic" subjects in their districts' core curricula because they embody these qualities. They give us insight into what art education can and should be.

As an institution vitally concerned with illuminating the value of the arts to a civilized society and their value to the educational development of children, the Getty hopes this report will prove useful to all those who share our concerns.

Leilani Lattin Duke
Director
Getty Center for Education in the Arts
Los Angeles, Fall 1984

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts' other research and development activities include: The Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts, a staff development and curriculum implementation pilot project with Los Angeles County school districts; a children's television series on the arts co-sponsored with the National Endowment for the Arts; assessments of museum education needs, teacher training programs in art education and discipline-based art curricula; and the development of discipline-based art education theory and application.

THE ARTS, LANGUAGE, AND THE SCHOOLS

> Great nations write their autobiographies in three manuscripts, the book of their deeds, the book of their words and the book of their art. Not one of these books can be understood unless we read the two others, but of the three the only trustworthy one is the last.
>
> John Ruskin

We humans are no match for the lion in strength, are outstripped by the ostrich in speed, win no medals against the dolphin in swimming, can smell less acutely than the dog, cannot see as well as the hawk during the day or the cat during the night. Yet, so far as we know and understand, it is the human species that excels in the use of symbols. The sending and receiving of sophisticated messages sets us apart from all other creatures on the planet earth.

We build our nests, seek our mates, destroy our enemies. But unlike the other forms of life, we take infinite pains to express our experiences and record our relationships and feelings, accomplishments, and failures. We capture those experiences and by means of symbols send them on to others through a process we call language.

In the early dawn of civilization our first parents used sticks and stones and grunts and groans to convey feelings and ideas. Then words were formed; a vocabulary took shape followed by written squiggles, making it possible to send messages from place to place and transmit them from one generation to another.

Then written and spoken language was enriched. Poets used words to create metaphors, forcing us to view familiar things in unfamiliar ways while the rhythm of the words carried another kind of meaning.

But even with the beauty of the written and the spoken word, language skill was incomplete. There remained those human experiences that could not be captured by the sounds and visual impressions we call words. These symbols simply could not portray adequately such joy as the coming of spring or grief and loneliness at the ending of love. They could not adequately convey the sound of the babbling brook.

For the most intimate, most profoundly moving universal experiences we needed a more subtle, more sensitive set of symbols, a richer language we call *the arts*. From the dawn of civilization men and women have used music, dance, and the visual arts to transmit the heritage of a people most effectively and to express the deepest human joys and sorrows most profoundly.

Murray Sidlin, the conductor of the New Haven Symphony, said:

> When words are no longer adequate, when our passion is greater than we are able to express in a usual manner, people turn to art. Some people go to the canvas and paint; some stand up and dance. But we all go beyond our normal means of communicating and this is the common human experience for all people on this planet.

Those people who uniquely extend and add such richness to our language we call artists. But everyone, to be truly human, must be able to respond to the subtle messages only the arts can adequately convey. We cannot define beauty any more satisfactorily than we can adequately define the arts. Yet all of us can recognize it when we see or hear it, and the more we experience it, the more sensitive we become to its appeal.

Art education, then, is basic because it extends our language—enlarges the store of the images we use—it makes our understanding discriminating and comprehensive. Music, dance,

and the visual arts are languages that reach all people at their deepest and most essential human level. Thus, aesthetic literacy is as basic as linguistic literacy.

Ironically, although many schools undervalue the arts, dictators recognize the power of nonverbal symbols in shaping attitudes and values. Tyrants who seek to control the hearts and minds of men not only censor speech but music, dance, and the visual arts. Hitler destroyed books and controlled speech. But he also outlawed the arts that did not fit his twisted view of life. Stalin exiled Russia's splendid poets but he also suppressed new forms of art.

The point is this: Artists, moved by the world's events, can use their symbols powerfully to convey feelings and ideas. Thus, when Picasso confronts the unspeakable agonies of war—the dismembered child, the scream of the bereft mother, the shattered home—and puts them on a huge canvas called *Guernica*, he makes a stunning statement about destruction that words cannot convey.

Our twentieth century has seen a crippling of the human spirit. Fragmentation abounds. Students are directed to one narrow branch of knowledge and they lose a larger vision. Even the arts have so separated themselves that those studying music, or painting, or literature do not see connections. Humanities students specialize in "periods"—renaissance, baroque, 18th century, modern—hardly conversant with traditions outside those little boxes.

The time has come for education to reaffirm the breadth and richness of our language, to rejoice in both verbal and nonverbal symbols, too. From birth on, the human mind is both stocked and stoked with images from all our senses. Although it is not clear how the process works, we do know that every style we receive evokes layers and shades of meaning. The meaning of idioms, such as "we worked around the clock," depends on complicated combinations of images, culture bound. But Dali's painting *The Persistence of Memory* can be universally understood by those haunted by the notion of inevitable changes with time. And art is perhaps humanity's most essential, most universal language.

The arts are not a frill. They are an essential part of language. Indeed, the quality of civilization can be measured by the breadth of the symbols that are used. And beyond words we also need music, dance, and the visual arts to give expression to the profound urgings of the human spirit.

Now more than ever, all people need to see clearly, hear acutely, and feel sensitively through the arts. These languages are no longer just desirable. They are essential if we are to convey adequately our deepest feelings and survive with civility and joy.

Prepared for the Getty Center for Education in the Arts
Dr. Ernest Boyer
August 1984

WHY ART IN EDUCATION AND WHY ART EDUCATION?

When a nation is at risk, when from all sides we hear of the vast number of functional illiterates leaving our schools, when remedial courses are over-subscribed at even our most selective colleges, the thought of making the case for so seemingly a marginal subject as art in our schools is especially daunting. How can one recommend that the schools' most precious resource—time—be directed from what is truly basic in education to the "luxury" of studying art? How can one propose that teachers divert their attention from the skills that are fundamental to economic well-being to an area of study that "properly" comes after basic educational needs have been met? How can one propose a broad course of study when the schools have apparently been failing at their more narrowly defined tasks?

It is the case for art and art education I wish to present. This case rests upon three major arguments. First, work in the arts develops unique and important mental skills. Second, the arts represent the highest of human achievements to which students should have access. Third, the school is the primary public institution that can make such access possible for the vast majority of students in our nation.

It is tempting to reduce the possibilities of education to simple aspirations, to simplify complex problems so that they seem amenable to quick solutions, to embrace images of schooling that harken back to simpler, more rose-colored times. But such visions of the past are inadequate educational fare for the present. The so-called basics—the Three Rs—were never adequate in the education of free men and women. They are even less adequate today.

The ability to experience the arts of our culture is not an automatic consequence of maturation. What children are able to think about, what they are able to experience, the distance their imaginative life allows them to travel are shaped by the kind of educational lives they have had an opportunity to lead. For children and adolescents, schooling defines a major portion of their lives. Being compelled by law to devote forty or more weeks per year to school creates for them a culture of opportunities—or of opportunities forgone. It is we, the adults who created the policies that define the educational environment in which so much of their time is spent, who influence the kinds of minds children and adolescents will have an opportunity to develop. It is the curriculum of the school and the quality and amount of time devoted to its various parts that define the opportunities students will have to become "literate" in various fields that animate and give substance to our culture. In this sense it can be reasonably argued that the school's curriculum is a mind-altering device.

Our educational policies are designed to shape the minds of the young. Of course, we do not define these policies with such aims in mind; our conceptions of what we do are seldom so ambitious. Yet the effect of our choices, the nature of our priorities, the messages we give to teachers, school administrators, and not least of all, students, do precisely this. Through the curricular choices we make we tell the young what we believe is important for them to learn. We tell teachers what they should devote their attention to. And we convey to principals in countless ways how their schools, hence how they, will be evaluated.

In this scheme of things the arts are seldom in the mainstream of our values. We treat them as outside the core of schooling. Yet we do this at the same time that our culture regards the arts as among the highest of human achievements: We build palaces we call museums to display the fruits of artistic inquiry and construct concert halls to experience the heights we

can reach through music. In effect, we recognize as a culture that the arts represent the apotheosis of human achievement yet, paradoxically, we provide little place for them in our schools.

The results of such neglect are clear. Only a small percentage of our population visits our museums or attends concert halls. For most people, the achievements presented in such places are other people's delights. Yet through taxation all citizens pay for them. All of us underwrite what a small minority can appreciate and enjoy.

If the arts had no unique qualities, if the achievements of great artists were of no more consequence than any program randomly selected from daytime television, the loss would not be significant. Great art has something unique to provide. The ability to experience such art enlightens in a special way and stretches the mind in the process. The arts present to the competent eye those facets of feeling and insight that only artistic form can reveal. There is no verbal equivalent of Bach's Mass in B Minor. Words cannot convey what the music expresses. But the messages in these works are not there simply for the taking. They must, so to speak, be recovered. They must be read. The works themselves must be unwrapped to be experienced. School programs that do not provide adequate time and attention to the arts deny students access to a stunning part of their culture. Such students simply are unable to read our most profound forms of human achievement.

I intentionally used the word "read" in the previous sentence. Visual and musical forms are patterned forms. They are forms that reflect a history. They are forms influenced by purpose, shaped by technology, and possessing the signature of their authors. To recover the meanings these forms possess requires an ability to read the languages they use. It requires one to understand, for example, that Monet would paint the very same haystack four times during the same day, not because he was interested in haystacks but because he was interested in the way light illuminated them at different times. One profits from understanding De Chirico's interest in revealing the world of the unconscious by juxtaposing trains, clock towers, and huge artichokes. Artists have purposes and their purposes differ. The experience of art is enhanced by understanding what artists have wanted to accomplish.

We do, of course, recognize that in the study of history Thomas Jefferson's particular vision of democracy is related to our understanding of the Declaration of Independence. We teach children about President Wilson's desire to create a worldwide deliberative body—a League of Nations— and that his efforts are relevant for understanding the period after World War I. Indeed, it would be a shallow historical understanding—or no understanding at all—to neglect such features of the past. The fine arts require no less.

The argument thus far is straightforward. When, through our policies and priorities, we define the school curriculum, we define what students will have an opportunity to learn. The opportunities they have to learn influence the character of their mental life.

Even though they represent the highest levels of human achievement in our culture, the fine arts are now afforded little place in the school curriculum. At the elementary school level they command less than 3 percent of the instructional time per week, and at the secondary level approximately 80 percent of all high school students never enroll in a fine arts course during the four years they are in attendance. Less than 3 percent of all school districts require study in one of the fine arts as a condition for graduation.

The result of access denied is a program of education that leaves most students unable to participate in the arts; the great museums and concert halls that populate the nation are the resources of a small minority of our citizens. Artistic literacy is a rare educational commodity.

Thus far the major argument I have advanced focuses upon access to what might be called "cultural capital." There is, however, another line of argument that I believe to be equally compelling. This argument is that particular kinds of mental processes are elicited and developed by work in the arts.

If one examines the character of what is taught in schools, particularly elementary schools, it becomes apparent that for the most part the tasks that students confront are characterized by a highly rule-governed structure. For example, arithmetic problems require that children learn the four basic operations and how these operations apply to the treatment of numerals. To be correct in arithmetic is to know the right way to perform a particular operation. If a student is in doubt, the student can prove the answer by performing the appropriate operation.

In learning to spell, there is a correct and an incorrect way to arrange the letters that constitute words in the English language. The spelling of words, like the problems children encounter in arithmetic, are either correct or incorrect. Similarly, in punctuation, there tends to be a correct and an incorrect way to evaluate the sentences children are asked to write. In learning to write there are models that children are asked to copy so that their letters can be read. Even in early reading there are correct meanings to the sentences and paragraphs children are asked to read. In short, the vast majority of academic tasks young children encounter in school are driven by a rule-governed system that provides little space for personal interpretation; right and wrong are a part of the lexicon that elementary school children are taught to internalize.

What do such tasks mean for students? What does it mean to children to have a curriculum in which fealty to rule is a pervasive feature? Such conditions can lead to a population of rule followers. One of the greatest of educational fallacies, John Dewey once said, is the belief that children learn only what they are taught. Children learn the covert lessons as well. The school's curriculum is currently heavily weighted toward a rule-governed view of learning; there is a correct and an incorrect answer to each question raised, the teacher knows the correct answer, and the student's task is to get it right.

In the arts no comparable "comforts" exist. There is no single correct answer to an artistic problem; there are many. There is no procedure to tell the student with certainty that his or her solution is correct. There is no algorithm that one can use to solve an artistic problem; one must depend upon that most exquisite of human capacities—judgment.

The exercise of judgment in the making or artistic images or in their appreciation depends upon the ability to cope with ambiguity, to experience nuance, and to weigh the trade-offs among alternative courses of action. These skills represent not only the mind operating in its finest hour, but are precisely the skills that characterize our most complex adult life tasks. The problems that perplex us as adults are not those that can be treated by algorithms and verified by proof. School programs that inadvertently teach children there is a correct answer to each important problem they encounter mis-teach children in serious ways. The cultivation of judgment and the ability to be flexibly purposive are best achieved when the tasks and content children encounter in school provide the space for such skills to operate. When the arts are well taught such skills have an essential place.

There is yet another aspect of mental development that effective teaching in the arts fosters. Ironically, it is an aspect of human development that in our culture we regard as distinct from mind. I speak of the cultivation of the senses. Since Plato's time, the senses have been regarded as separate from mental life; they are considered lower in the hierarchy of human capacities. We typically separate feeling from thinking, emotion from thought, the head from

the hand, and the mind from the body. This view is mistaken. The eye is a part of the mind, and the ability to read the qualitative world in which we live is the major avenue through which those forms we call thoughts are constructed. All thinking requires a content, and that content emanates from our contact with the world. It is our sensory system that first provides the "material" we experience, reflect upon, and eventually manipulate. It is our capacity to create images from the world we are able to experience that feeds our imagination. When our sensibilities are dulled or ill-developed, the content for reflection and imagination is itself limited. The sensibilities, wrote Herbert Read, are the sources of our consciousness. Learning to see and hear are therefore the avenues through which our awareness is raised. To learn to see and to hear is to achieve a realization of some aspect of the world; it is to the ability to achieve this realization that the arts contribute so importantly. They call attention to the qualities of the world, they direct us to its subtleties, they distill and present those qualities in vivid and stable form. We can eventually see the geometries of the city through a painting by Charles Sheeler or its loneliness through one by Edward Hopper. We begin to discover what fields of color can do through the work of Josef Albers, or how the power of line can shape our feeling through the images of Franz Kline. Our senses yield sensation and from sensation we ascend to the aesthetic. The aesthetic gives rise to feeling. Unlike the anaesthetic, which dulls it, art functions in the service of feeling by reestablishing the connection between mind and the senses.

In schools these connections are seldom recognized. The environment of schooling is often aesthetically barren—think of the places where soft surfaces exist in schools. It is a difficult task. Formica desks occupying a right-angled environment are easier to recall. To the extent the arts balance the environmental picture, to the extent they cultivate those aspects of mental life that are now neglected in the schools, they give the young an opportunity to realize their human potential. The absence of the arts in the schools is not only a denial of access to the jewels of our culture, it is a denial of the opportunity to cultivate the mental potential children possess.

Why arts in the school? As content, the arts represent man's best work. Our children ought to have access to such work, and they should know that we care that they do. When we define our school curricula, we not only provide children with access to the intellectual and artistic capital of our culture, we also tell the young what we value for them. Surely the arts are among the things we ought to care about.

The arts are important not only because of what they represent, they are important because of the ways in which they engage and develop human intellectual ability. To learn to see and to make visual form are complex and subtle tasks. The child needs to learn how to look, not simply to assign a label to what is seen, but to experience the qualities he attends. Artistic tasks, unlike so much of what is now taught in schools, develop the ability to judge, to assess, to experience a range of meanings that exceed what we are able to say in words. The limits of language are not the limits of our consciousness. The arts, more than any other area of human endeavor, exploit this important human capacity.

Even if we were to argue that the arts can make exquisite contributions to the quality of our lives, it would not follow automatically that they should be taught in the schools. It takes no great leap of imagination to recognize that the achievements about which I have written do not occur on their own. One does not acquire subtle and complex appreciations of complicated forms simply by getting older. What the culture in general provides—particularly in the arts—cultivates only a small fraction of what children are capable of achieving. Not to provide for an effective program in arts education in the schools is to teach children we do not care

about the arts and that it is unimportant that they learn to read them. If these are not the messages we wish to convey, then programs must be provided, time must be made available, and teachers must acquire the skills to teach the arts in substantive and meaningful ways. Without a program, adequate time, and skilled teaching, our aspirations in this area, as in any other, are no more than empty hopes.

Why arts education? Because without it the vast majority of our children will be denied access to the arts and to the opportunities to develop the mental skills that work in the arts makes possible. We can choose to restrict our program and deny our children their cultural legacy or we can give them the opportunity to participate in the artistic wealth our culture possesses. What kind of children and what kind of culture do we want?

Elliot W. Eisner
Stanford University
1984

PREFACE

This report conveys the findings from a cross-site analysis of seven sites that were implementing a discipline-based approach to visual arts education. A discipline-based approach incorporates four art disciplines in the classroom—art history, art criticism, aesthetics, and art making. The study addresses two major questions: What are the factors that generate support for a strong, substantive art education program in a distict's curriculum? What factors influence the willingness and ability of school districts and teachers to carry out and maintain a discipline-based art education program? The research was supported by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, an operating entity of the J. Paul Getty Trust. Two additional volumes in this study series are:

Michael Day, Elliot Eisner, Robert Stake, Brent Wilson, and Marjorie Wilson, *Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production: An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Vol. II. Case Studies of Seven Selected Sites*, The Rand Corporation, R-3161/2-JPG, December 1984.

Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, Margaret A. Thomas, and Joyce Peterson, *Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production: An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Vol. III. Executive Summary*, The Rand Corporation, R-3161/3-JPG, December 1984.

SUMMARY

THE PROBLEM

The nation's public schools have historically neglected art education. That neglect reflects two pervasive attitudes: that art per se is not vital to a child's education and that instruction in the visual arts is not properly an *educational* activity. However, for the last 20 years, leading arts educators have been challenging these attitudes and advocating a change. They have argued that art education is as fundamentally important for human development as training in "basics" such as mathematics, science, and language. On this basis, they have urged that the schools take a more comprehensive and rigorous approach to art education, developing discipline-based programs that provide balanced, sequential instruction in aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and studio production.[1]

Prompted by findings in some of the national reports on education, many school administrators and teachers are beginning to listen to these arguments. They are reaffirming the importance of language, mathematics, science, and computer literacy. However, they have begun to consider balancing the curriculum with subjects that nurture imaginative cognition, develop understanding and appreciation of man's highest artistic achievements, deepen understanding of culture and history, and sharpen perceptive and analytical skills that are vital for higher-order mental tasks.

NATURE OF THE STUDY

The J. Paul Getty Trust has taken this shift in attitude as an opportunity to work with school personnel and the arts communities to improve the quality of arts education. Through the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, it is supporting research and dissemination activities aimed at understanding what constitutes art education and how it can be taught. The study summarized here was supported by the Getty Center to make the first systematic examination of public school programs that try to provide balanced instruction in art criticism, art history, and art production.

In this study, we were immediately struck by the scarcity of districts that offer programs remotely resembling discipline-based instruction in the three domains. However, by gathering material on districts nominated by 100 experts on art education, and with the assistance of five educators experienced in evaluating art programs, we finally identified seven promising sites. We undertook a cross-site analysis of these districts' programs and experiences in making the change to a substantive arts program. Each of the five arts educators made detailed case studies of one or more of the sites.[2]

---

[1]By discipline-based, we mean that a program builds on the body of expertise, scholarship, and exemplary works generated by art education, aesthetic theory, art criticism, and art history.

[2]Those case studies are reported in M. Day et al., *Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production: An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Vol. II. Case Studies of Seven Selected Sites*, The Rand Corporation, R-3161/2-JPG, October 1984. They also provided some material for the study's Executive Summary by Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, Margaret A. Thomas, and Joyce Peterson: *Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production: An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Vol. III. Executive Summary*, The Rand Corporation, R-3161/3-JPG, October 1984.

In the cross-site analysis, we sought to answer two major questions. First, what are the critical characteristics of a discipline-based art education program? Second, what factors make administrators and teachers willing and able to initiate and maintain such a program? To answer these questions, we visited the sites and collected data on the districts' art education programs, their place in the districts' curricula, and the factors that contributed to their development and should affect their future course. Our data-gathering activities focused on factors that appeared important at the three stages of change: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization.

The study found that there is no ideal way to make the change to a comprehensive art program. Those who want changes must consider not only their programmatic objectives but also the institutional setting. However, we did identify the basic characteristics such a program must have and the factors crucial for its successful establishment, and we were able to clarify the issues involved in that change.

Successful programs may differ in approach and substance. However, our research suggests that to become "academically respectable" and support the factors necessary for change, a visual arts program must have these basic characteristics: an articulated conceptual base and a written, sequential curriculum that reflects this base. Beyond that, they may take various forms.

The change to a discipline-based arts program requires more than a change in policies and practices—it requires a shift in perspective. Previous Rand work has shown that any kind of institutional change is difficult to design, initiate, and implement. It is even more difficult when it requires that people accept new concepts and develop new attitudes. People at all levels will have to alter their assumptions about the value of art, its place in the curriculum, and how it should be taught. Until this happens, substantive arts education will not have the broad support needed to make such a tremendous change.

Second, arts programs will have to be conceived, developed, and maintained as other basic programs are. This means that university scholars will have to work closely with curriculum specialists and teachers to develop programs informed by the theory, body of expertise, and exemplary works of art criticism, history, and production. To ensure the continuing integrity of these programs, district policies will have to include extensive in-service teacher training; a prescriptive, comprehensive curriculum; and classroom review by district representatives.

Third, programs must have politically adept advocates to generate interest in change. They must also have the moral and financial support of district and school administrators, and the support and commitment of teachers, parents, and students, at every stage of change. The analysis also repeatedly showed that program viability, consistency, and quality depended critically on the coordination and other support provided by a district-level art specialist. Only with this broad support can programs be developed, put in place, and successfully maintained despite financial constraints and changes in the environment.

Beyond the problems involved in change, art educators will have to consider other issues before art education can realize its potential. Arts advocates and policymakers will have to consider means of generating support networks to create demand for substantive arts programs. However, advocates, policymakers, and researchers alike face a major challenge in effecting change: the lack of a knowledge base and of model programs. We really know very little about the present status of art education or about exactly what a discipline-based, sequential program should look like. Consequently, it is difficult to "show" legislators, school administrators, teachers, and parents what changes are needed. Another issue is the need for professional development at all levels of the system. Moreover, the benefits of this

development must be reinforced by continuing interaction between theorists and practitioners, universities and schools, and administrators and teachers.

All these issues are intertwined and must be addressed simultaneously before districts can make substantive arts education part of their curricula.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A study of this magnitude would not be possible without the cooperation of many people. In particular, we are indebted to the school district staffs in the study sites for responding so openly and fully to our inquiries. Only parsimony prevents us from acknowledging every respondent by name. We would like to thank several key respondents in each site, however, for this study would not have been possible without their assistance: Dr. Newman Walker, Superintendent, Mr. John Martin, Assistant Superintendent, and Ms. Kay Alexander, Art Specialist, Palo Alto, California; Dr. Eldon Gleichman, Superintendent, and Ms. Michele Olsen, Art Specialist, Champaign, Illinois; Mr. Robert Oaks, Superintendent, and Ms. Nancy Roucher, Director, Project HEART, Decatur, Illinois; Dr. Arthur Bruning, Superintendent, Dr. Frank Brendemuehl, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Ms. Carol Sirrine, Fine Arts Specialist, and Ms. Nancy Pauly, Elementary Art Specialist, Hopkins, Minnesota; Dr. Jerrold Glassman, Superintendent, and Ms. Aileen Golden, Cultural Arts Supervisor, Brooklyn, New York; Mr. Robert Zimpfer, Superintendent, Ms. Janice Plank and Ms. Elizabeth Katz, Art Specialists, Whitehall, Ohio; Dr. E. E. Brickell, Superintendent, Ms. Stefana Runyan, Art Supervisor, Virginia Beach, Virginia; Dr. Lee McLaurin, Superintendent, and Mr. Kent Anderson, Curriculum Specialist for Art, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

We extend very special thanks to Ms. Leilani Lattin Duke, Director of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts. In her capacity as The Getty Trust's Project Officer, she served as an inspiration to us all. We were fortunate to have her active involvement and guidance throughout the study's duration.

Thanks are also given to our technical reviewers, who made many useful suggestions for improvements on earlier drafts of this report: Dr. Richard Shavelson of The Rand Corporation; Dr. Robert Saunders, Art Consultant, Connecticut State Department of Education; Dr. Madeleine Grumet, Professor of Education, Hobart and William Smith Colleges; Dr. James Mason, Dean of College of Fine Arts, Brigham Young University; and Dr. D. Jack Davis, Professor of Art and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, North Texas State University.

Finally, we would like to thank the many people who helped get this report published: Louise McLaurin, who took rough copy and graciously turned it into typed copy—again and again; Helen Turin, who from a hospital bed performed editorial miracles on earlier drafts; Sally Kostal, who kept track of everything and kept it all moving into production; Peg Schumacher, who along with other very competent professionals in the Rand Publications Department—too numerous to mention—turned the bits and pieces into a finished product.

All of these people made this study possible and substantially improved the result. They are, of course, in no way responsible for any shortcomings it may contain.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD iii

THE ARTS, LANGUAGE, AND THE SCHOOLS vii

WHY ART IN EDUCATION AND WHY ART EDUCATION? ix

PREFACE xv

SUMMARY xvii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS xxi

TABLES xxv

Section

I. INTRODUCTION 1
- Study Premise 2
- Study Purpose 3

II. STUDY DESIGN 4
- Site Selection 4
- Data Collection and Analysis 5
- Data Base: The Art Education Programs 5
- Whitehall 7
- Hopkins 8
- Palo Alto (SPECTRA) 9
- Decatur/Champaign (Project HEART) 10
- Brooklyn #15 11
- Virginia Beach 11
- Milwaukee 12
- Summary 13

III. INITIATION 15
- Issues and Outcomes 15
- Factors Affecting Initiation 19

IV. IMPLEMENTATION 27
- Issues and Outcomes 27
- Factors Affecting Implementation Outcomes 29

V. INSTITUTIONALIZATION 35
- Issues and Outcomes 35
- Factors Affecting Institutionalization 39

VI: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 45
An Articulated Conceptual Base 45
A Written Curriculum 46
A Sequential Curriculum 46
Factors That Support Art Education 46
Policy Implications 51

Appendix: SEVEN COMMON TOPICS FOR DATA COLLECTION 57

BIBLIOGRAPHY 61

TABLES

1. Art Education Program and District Features 6
2. The Education Emphasis in the Three Domains 14
3. Institutionalization Outcomes 36

I. INTRODUCTION

America is concerned about her schools. Education is front page news as at least nine major national reports on the status of education sound alarms about the quality of teachers and their professional preparation, the content of the school curriculum, the time devoted to academic tasks, and the level of support and leadership afforded the public schools. (For a review of these reports, see Griesemer and Butler, 1983.)

The relative neglect of the arts and the generally peripheral status of the arts in the nation's public schools is described and decried in at least two of these reports. Ernest Boyer is eloquent in *High School*, arguing, "The arts are an essential part of the human experience. They are not a frill" (Boyer, 1983, p. 98). Yet he finds little evidence of arts being given priority or even adequate attention in the schools. Similarly, John Goodlad, in *A Place Called School*, finds that students at all levels rate the arts as "relatively unimportant" (Goodlad, 1984, p. 219).

The activities that constitute art education in most of the nation's classrooms do little to advance art's position as a necessary or legitimate subject. The visual arts education experienced by most elementary school students is often little more than involvement in "crafty" projects that have scant claim to systematic, disciplined instruction. Further, few art programs go beyond studio-based activities to incorporate heritage, history, criticism, or aesthetics. Goodlad (1984, p. 220) summarized the state of art education in his massive study of schooling by saying, "the impression I get of the arts programs in the schools studied is that they go little beyond coloring, polishing and playing. . . . What does not come through in our data is much if any indication that the arts were being perceived as central to personal satisfaction in a world rich in art forms, processes and products." Laura Chapman (1982, p. xiii) calls this state of affairs *Instant Art, Instant Culture:*

> Instant art, like many other instant products in our lives, makes few demands on all who participate in it. It requires minimum skill, little or no knowledge, the least possible effort, and practically no investment of time. Instant art is a sham, but it has become the standard fare American schools offer to most of our young people. It is one manifestation of our national ambivalence about the role of art in public education.

Two somewhat different attitudes reinforce this point of view about art education. One is that art per se is not seen as vital to a youngster's education. Art, in this view, has an ancillary position in the curriculum as a "fun" or therapeutic activity. (See Chapman, 1982; Eisner, 1972, Ch. 2.) The second is the view that the visual arts are not properly an "educational" activity—that "the arts, with few exceptions, can be experienced, comprehended, and created with little or no formal education" (Chapman, 1982, p. 4). Talent for the making of art, in this view, is intuitive and God-given; appreciation is described by the "I know what I like" school of thought. Valuable educational resources are not required.

Although on the whole the arts do not figure prominently in the national reports assessing the condition of education and in recommendations for curricular change, the advocacy for reexamining art education and its place in the instructional program that emerges from these assessments is influential. The College Board (1983) includes the arts among what it terms the basic academic subjects. Boyer (1982, p. 98) underscores the critical contribution of the arts to education and human experience:

> We recommend that all students study the arts to discover how human beings use non-verbal symbols and communicate not only with words but through music, dance, and the visual arts. . . . Now, more than ever, all people need to see clearly, hear acutely, and feel sensitively through the arts. These skills are no longer just desirable. They are essential if we are to survive together with civility and joy.

Goodlad's (1984, p. 220) conclusions about the importance of art reinforce this view: "To grow up without the opportunity to develop . . . sophistication in arts appreciation is to grow up deprived." As a result of these public admonishments to attend to the arts, many school administrators and teachers are beginning to reassess their notions of a well-rounded education. While acknowledging the importance of language, mathematics, science, and computer literacy, many educators also wish to balance the curriculum by including subjects that nurture certain thought and expression, develop understanding of diverse cultural values, and foster the ability to communicate nonverbally. The discussions generated by these recent studies of schooling give policymakers an opportunity to consider how education in the arts can be made more substantive, vigorous, and intellectually meaningful.

The J. Paul Getty Trust, a private operating foundation, saw these discussions as an opportunity to work with school personnel and the arts communities to improve the quality of arts education.[1] The Trust's commitment to this goal was manifested in 1982 with the creation of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts.[2]

Two important premises guide the activities of the Getty Center. First, because the arts are a repository of culture, study of the arts is a principal means of understanding human experience and transmitting cultural values; a human being is never adequately educated without having studied the arts. Second, if we want to change the way the arts are perceived by the public and taught in the schools, we need a more comprehensive understanding of how to translate theories of art education into practice.

STUDY PREMISE

The perspective adopted by the Getty Center and embraced by this study is that a substantive arts program should help children understand the historical and cultural contexts in which art has been created. It should help them to perceive aesthetic qualities in nature, in the manmade environment, and in works of art. It should provide them with opportunities to create their own works. And it should encourage them to describe, analyze, and interpret works of art. All of these components are necessary to achieve a more comprehensive, rigorous approach to the arts in school.

But appreciating art, making art, and understanding art all require instruction. As with any subject in which formal instruction is necessary, a body of expertise, scholarship, and exemplary works exists that should form the core of study. Education in the visual arts is no exception. It should be approached as a serious subject with a sequential curriculum that balances and integrates instruction in four domains: art history, criticism, studio production, and aesthetics.

Yet, developing, introducing, and successfully carrying out an art education program that has a sequential curriculum, that integrates art criticism, aesthetics, and history as well as the

---

[1]Adapted from Duke, 1984.

[2]The Center is one of several operating entities of the J. Paul Getty Trust. The Trust's other operating entities include: the J. Paul Getty Museum; the Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities; the Getty Conservation Institute; the Art History Information Program; the Metropolitan Museum/Getty Program for Art on Film; and the Museum Management Institute.

making of art, and that has a strong discipline base presents a change problem of the highest order.[3] It is not evident that central actors—school board members, teachers, administrators, or parents—have much interest in a strong art education program. Thus mobilizing the resources and commitment necessary to launch a strong art education program is not straightforward or easy, especially in a time of tight resources.

Even if district administrators and overseers were committed to a strong art education program that incorporated art criticism, aesthetics, and history as well as production, implementing such an activity would be difficult. There are few examples today of teaching practices that reflect this perspective. Furthermore, this approach to art education is at odds with the background and training of both generalist classroom teachers and art specialists. Although art specialists have background in studio instruction, they often have little or no proficiency in art criticism, art history, and aesthetic perception; they need to acquire this background. Generalist teachers responsible for art education need to attain confidence in teaching art making as well as criticism, aesthetics, and history. And perhaps even more problematical, art education of the type pursued in this study requires that both generalist and specialist teachers learn a new point of view about art education—one that emphasizes a sequential, discipline-based approach to instruction. The teacher's task is not simply learning a new skill or classroom routine, it is the acquisition of new attitudes and beliefs. And the administrator's task is establishing new priorities and assumptions for the district's art program.

STUDY PURPOSE

This perspective about what should constitute an education in the visual arts reflects a viewpoint that has been advocated by leading art educators for the last 20 years.[4] Yet there are few examples today of teaching practices that reflect this perspective. To understand why, one of the first activities undertaken by the Getty Center was this study of visual arts education programs in public schools that appeared guided by a comprehensive approach to arts instruction.

The purpose of this study was to try to answer two major questions. First, what are the factors that generate support for a strong, substantive art education program in a district's curriculum? Second, what factors influence the willingness and ability of school districts and teachers to carry out and maintain a discipline-based art education that strives for balance among the historical, critical, and productive domains of the visual arts? The analysis reported here aims to identify and elaborate the similarities and differences among the programs and to assess particular factors associated with sustaining art education programs in view of declining enrollments, shrinking budgets, and the continuing emphasis on basic reading and computational skills.

The Getty Center also contracted with five educators experienced in evaluating art programs to analyze and develop case reports of the programs selected for study. These reports can be found in Vol. II of this series, *Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production: An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Vol. II. Case Studies of Seven Selected Sites.*

---

[3] For this study, discipline-based art education means to center art education content on three areas of study inherent in the discipline of art: art production, art history, and art criticism. Its aim is to enable all youngsters, whatever their innate abilities, to acquire the skills, knowledge, and attitudes appropriate for making or encountering works of art as an educated adult.

[4] Barkan, 1962; Broudy, 1979; Eisner, 1976; McFee and Degge, 1977.

II. STUDY DESIGN

As a first step in this research effort, the Getty Center contracted with analysts at The Rand Corporation to undertake a study of change and development across selected visual arts education programs. In total, seven sites were selected for study based on a nationwide search. This report presents a cross-site analysis of the seven sites. The rest of this section discusses the study's design and methodology and describes the data base. Sections III-V analyze the process of change in art education. The analysis examines factors that support or constrain school district programs when these programs address the three domains, and art is accorded status as an important instructional area. Study conclusions and policy recommendations are contained in Section VI.

SITE SELECTION

An initial step in this research process was to locate districts that were attempting to provide art education in the three domains. Experts from the fields of art, art education, and education were asked to nominate districts with promising programs attending to art history, art criticism, and art production.

In particular, we were looking for *district-wide* programs rather than school- or classroom-level programs bearing these attributes. Since that time the thinking of the Getty Center has evolved to include four domains—separating the discipline of aesthetics from that of art history, art criticism, and art production. (Aesthetics means the study of the nature of art, the value of art, and its role in society.) However, this study did not systematically examine whether students in classrooms were exposed to aesthetics, and the model of the aesthetician is still not well-enough developed for us to know precisely what it means for schools and education; therefore, the content of this study addresses only the three domains. Over 100 experts in state departments of education, universities, art and art education organizations, and local school districts across the country were contacted and interviewed. Program materials were collected from school districts nominated as promising by the experts. For the most part, these program materials consisted of art curricula and curriculum guides, statements of philosophical approach, and descriptions of special components, such as joint museum-school programs. Project staff, including the five educators responsible for writing the case reports,[1] reviewed these program materials, looking for evidence of the three domains, an approach to art education that was compatible with the Getty Center's perspective, and special programs that might inform certain aspects of art education in particular. The goal was to select four sites for in-depth study that represented a cross-section in terms of district size and socioeconomic and ethnic makeup of the community, and geographic location.

From the nominations and a review of the program materials, project staff selected 12 school districts for preliminary site visits. One or two of the case study researchers with art education evaluation research experience visited each site for one to two days. During these visits the researchers interviewed art and other central office administrators concerning their art program, observed art classes, and spoke with art teachers in the schools. The purpose of

[1]Michael Day, Brigham Young University; Elliot Eisner, Stanford University; Robert Stake, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana; Brent Wilson, Pennsylvania State University; and Marjorie Wilson, Art Education Consultant.

these site visits was to determine how much each site attended to the three domains and could contribute to our understanding of the factors that constrain and enhance comprehensive instruction in visual arts education.

From these preliminary site visits, we selected seven diverse sites that subsequently agreed to participate in the study. These seven sites were not selected because their art education programs were judged exemplary, but rather because there was evidence that at all of the sites, an attempt was being made to develop and carry out district-wide art education programs that encompassed the three domains. The extent to which these sites are more or less successful at accomplishing their goals for art education forms the basis for this study. The seven sites are located in California, Illinois, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Virginia, and Wisconsin and range in size from 3100 to 85,000 students.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Three Rand policy analysts visited each of the seven sites during the spring of 1983. Data were collected on the district's art education program, its place in the district curriculum, and the factors that contributed to its development and should affect its future development. The analysts spoke with past and present art supervisors and central office art specialists, district superintendents, and other district administrators who fostered the programs, school board members, the classroom teachers responsible for art in each district, as well as other teachers whose classes intersected with the districts' art classes, students, parents, and community members interested and engaged in art education in the schools. The researchers observed art instruction in the classroom and in other locations such as museums and shopping centers; they attended art shows and curriculum and planning meetings; and they toured both the school and larger community facilities available to and used by the districts' art education programs.

To guide this cross-site analysis, the analysts examined factors that appeared important for the programs at various stages of development—initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. Some of the factors examined at these various stages of change included catalysts for innovation, role of state mandates, role of outside resources, individual leadership and advocacy, access to networks, depth and type of support or resistance, clarity of goals, degree of change attempted, scope and complexity of curriculum, resource requirements and availability, compatibility between general and art education goals, role of training and evaluation, degree of slip between the ideal and the real, and the status of art in the district. To supplement these data, the art education evaluators provided structured data from their sites under seven common topics (see the appendix).

DATA BASE: THE ART EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The sites selected varied considerably in their program and district features, as the data in Table 1 illustrate. Where art is taught and how it is taught can range from blue collar suburbia to an urban inner-city, in districts with 3100 to 85,000 students and from 6 to 142 schools, using generalist teachers or art specialists, or a combination of both. In Brooklyn, Milwaukee, and Virginia Beach it is the district's art education program as a whole that is of interest. However, in Hopkins, Palo Alto, Whitehall, and Champaign/Decatur, this analysis deals with only the part of the district's program that is most relevant to the Getty Center's

Table 1

ART EDUCATION PROGRAM AND DISTRICT FEATURES

	Whitehall	Hopkins	Palo Alto SPECTRA	Project HEART Decatur	Project HEART Champaign	Brooklyn # 15	Virginia Beach	Milwaukee
ART PROGRAM FEATURES								
Type of teacher delivering	Specialists	Generalists	Generalists/ artists	Generalists		Generalists/ & specialists	Specialists	Generalists & specialists
Number of Specialist art teachers	4 elementary 1 junior high	1 elementary	18 part time artists	1 elementary	1 elementary 4 sec	9 secondary	45 elementary 26 secondary	14 elementary 81 secondary
Curriculum Guidelines	Written	Written	Written	Written	Written	Not written	Written	Written
Grades covered	K-9	K-6	3/4-6	K-7	K-7	K-9	K-12	K12
DISTRICT FEATURES								
Total student enrollment	3,100	6,900	8,500	[illegible],000	8,200	20,700	54,800	84,900
Number of schools								
Elementary	4	6	14	20	10	20	45	108
Middle/junior high	1	2	2	4	3	5	7	19
High schools	1	1	2	3	2	N.A.	7	15
Urban/suburban	Suburban	Suburban	Suburban	Small city		Urban	Urban	Urban
Central office art personnel	0	.5 Fine Arts Supervisor	1.0 Art Consultant	1.0	0	1.0 Cultural Arts Supervisor	1.0 Arts Coordinator	1.0 Curriculum Specialist 1.0 Art Supervisor 5.0 Supervisory Art Teachers

objectives. In these sites, the program of interest is a subset of the district's art education program—either a special program that has been developed (SPECTRA in Palo Alto and Project HEART in Decatur), or a program developed for certain grade levels (Hopkins, Whitehall).

Each site's program of interest is briefly described below along with its theoretical underpinning and the curriculum guidelines that emerged. At each site we looked for evidence of discipline-based art education that encompassed the three domains (content) and was sequenced (that is, the concepts among lessons or among levels built upon each other). We also looked for evidence of a commonly perceived district art curriculum that included a written set of sequenced goals and objectives that are reflected in lesson plans; have been developed by the district for its own use; provide instruction in art making, art history, and art criticism; and are used by all teachers within a district to guide their art instruction. Moreover, we also looked for evidence in classroom practices of parity among the three domains. By parity we mean equality or near equality in the status or value accorded each domain, *not* equal instructional time.

WHITEHALL

Whitehall is a small, middle-class, increasingly transient community outside of Columbus, Ohio. Much of the support for art education in Whitehall seems to derive from curricular inheritance. Whitehall is reported "always" to have had art in the schools, even when its more affluent neighbors had none. The parents are highly supportive of the art program, although not especially active in the schools generally.

Although Whitehall has had an art program for many years, the district took steps to formalize its place in the curriculum five years ago. The art program of interest in Whitehall is this formalized program, which is currently in grades K–9. It is being developed and taught by the district's four elementary specialists and one junior high art specialist.

Whitehall bases its art education program on Manuel Barkan's model of the "troika" of art history, art criticism, and art studio activities.[2] This model was later refined and used as the intellectual and theoretical basis for the art education guides published by the Ohio State Department of Education. For example, the elementary guide identifies three major goals for art education:

1. Schools should help each child achieve personal fulfillment.
2. Schools should help improve society.
3. Schools should help transmit the cultural heritage.

For each elementary grade, sub-goals and activities are described showing ways that children both *express* feelings and ideas through their creative efforts, and *respond* to art works made by others. These goals and activities are based on a conception of art that had been broadened to include art criticism and art history as well as studio production.

Responsibility for developing Whitehall's art curriculum using the Ohio State guides rested with the district's art teachers, none of whom were experienced in curriculum development. Their approach, greatly simplified, was for each teacher to record his or her favorite art lessons and to overlay on these lessons art history and criticism along with and in proportion to studio activities. These lessons, or "encounters," were recorded on cards, each of which specified the lesson's focus (for example, elements of design or painting), appropriate grade

[2]M. Barkan, 1962, pp. 12–18.

levels, classroom activity, and resources and materials needed for the activity. The cards are housed in a plexiglass box and teachers can arrange and rearrange them in any sequence.

In the process of developing their curriculum, the teachers mapped the newly acquired and not fully assimilated concepts of history and criticism onto familiar routines, resulting in a curriculum that is highly usable and noteworthy, but in which studio activities predominate. At present, Whitehall's historical domain can be described as mainly picture study; students watch slides or filmstrips or study works of art in books and reproductions. The criticism portion of the program consists of looking at, writing about, and talking about works of art. Although students and teachers primarily critique the works on the basis of the elements and principles of design, they also sometimes use expressive qualities.

The Whitehall art curriculum is in a state of evolution. It still reflects the eclectic nature of its beginnings, but it is gradually being revised as the Whitehall art specialists continue to gain understanding of the concepts on which it is predicated. Initial attempts are being replaced with lessons that emphasize history and criticism as well as studio. A lack of continuity across classrooms and grades continues, however, because the district's art specialists made an explicit decision to maintain their autonomy—their "personal styles."

HOPKINS

Hopkins is a small suburban school district near Minneapolis with a nearly all-white population and a large percentage of affluent families. The art education program of interest is its elementary program, which relies heavily on a curriculum developed for grades K–6. Art teaching is the responsibility of the elementary classroom teachers with support from a single elementary art specialist. The district is currently in the process of developing its 7–12 art curriculum. This effort is headed by the district's half-time Fine Arts Supervisor. At the secondary levels, art is the responsibility of four junior high and two high school art specialists.

Hopkins, like Whitehall, bases its program on Manuel Barkan's model. Hopkins, however, went on to organize and structure these theoretical concepts using Piaget's developmental theory, which suggests that children are capable of more abstract and sophisticated activities as they grow older. The result is a curriculum that pays explicit attention to cognitive development in art education.

The Hopkins curriculum was developed through efforts in the district's central office, with the assistance of a professor of art education at the University of Minnesota who provided the conceptual organization. The written materials clearly reflect the curriculum's conceptual bases. The knowledge and skills associated with the three domains are incorporated into activities judged appropriate to children's developmental stages through the concepts of "producing" (studio) and "responding" (appreciative learning). Students participate in activities that emphasize both productive and responsive skills. "Responding" and "producing" objectives are listed under each of the art content categories (subject matter/theme, art form, visual qualities, function, style, and artists and their works) for every grade at the beginning of the manuals. There are four units for each grade with the themes: "this is my world," "learning to look," "art is all around us," and "I use artists' materials." Although each of these units can contribute to both productive and responsive knowledge and skills, units one and four generally favor the productive realm and units two and three favor the responsive realm. The structure for achieving a "balance" between the productive and responsive realms is therefore in place.

In Hopkins, each elementary grade has a curriculum booklet that is quite specific and correlates with the subsequent grade. Learning builds as the students move through the

grades. Children attend to simpler, more concrete projects and ideas at an earlier age and progress sequentially from grade to grade. Within a given grade, there is also sequencing across the units, with each building upon one another. The curriculum is, by design, highly prescriptive because classroom teachers are to be the implementors of the curriculum.

PALO ALTO (SPECTRA)

The Palo Alto Unified School District serves 8400 students in its 14 elementary, two middle, and two senior high schools. It has a reputation for excellence, with fully 90 percent of graduating seniors attending colleges and universities. The parents of Palo Alto students, a substantial portion of whom are upper middle class and college-educated, have high expectations for their children and expect the schools to perform accordingly. As one might expect, the Palo Alto community is preoccupied with the notion of credentials and places a high educational priority on the "basics."

Within this setting the Palo Alto Art Consultant developed the SPECTRA (Special Teacher Resources for Art) program, which is designed to provide, over a three-year period, a model of art education instruction for classroom teachers. It brings art specialists into grades 3/4–6 classrooms for one hour each week to conduct art lessons. The lessons are designed to give students an organized and comprehensive introduction to art heritage, art appreciation, and aesthetics and to practice with various artistic media and techniques. Classroom teacher involvement is phased: The first year, teachers observe only; the second and third years, they are expected to participate in the lesson, and finally they give at least one lesson with the SPECTRA artist acting as assistant. SPECTRA artists receive training from the district's art consultant in the teaching of art. Approximately 80 percent of the district's combination 3/4 through grade 6 teachers have been involved in the SPECTRA program, which began in January 1981.

The SPECTRA program in Palo Alto is based upon the belief that children should have the opportunity to create as well as to see and to respond to works of art. It is also based upon the belief that even elementary grade children can learn and become art historians and critics. The SPECTRA curriculum builds on the four components recommended for students in the visual arts by the California State Department of Education[3] and on the programs that the district's art consultant developed before coming to work in Palo Alto. SPECTRA consists of three units of curriculum. The first is titled "Line, Shape, Color, Space, Form and Texture" and contains 57 lessons to be taught over three semesters. The second is devoted to American art and is divided into two historical periods—1620 to 1900, and 1850 to the present. It contains 36 lessons to be taught over two semesters. The third, titled "A World at Art," consists of two parts: Part I examines ancient, medieval, renaissance, and baroque art; Part II emphasizes 1650 to the present. "A World at Art" contains 36 lessons and modifications for younger students.

Each of the SPECTRA lessons is self-contained, to be taught as an entity over a single classroom period. Each lesson has at least three parts. One part consists of a presentation and display by the teacher of one or more works of art intended to help students learn something about the work of a particular artist, about a particular period or style, or about some aspect of history of which the perception of art would be helpful. The second part consists of a

[3]These four components are: 1) aesthetic perception, visual and tactile; 2) creative expression—artistic knowledge and skills; 3) visual arts heritage—historical and cultural; and 4) aesthetic valuing—analysis, interpretation, and judgment (California State Department of Education, 1982).

productive activity related to the lesson's theme or content. Following this productive phase, students are to display their work and the class is to participate in supportive, constructive critiques of student work. Through the historical component of the curriculum, students are introduced each week to some new aspect of art heritage and some new artist, movement, style, or technique to which the studio portion is keyed. Less attention is given in the written curriculum to "evaluation" or aesthetic judgment and criticism. The SPECTRA program is sequential or continuous in design; within units there is articulation between the historical and the productive domain.

DECATUR/CHAMPAIGN (PROJECT HEART)

Central Illinois has an art education program called Project HEART (Helping Education through Arts Resources for Teachers)—an aesthetics-based visual arts education program. Project HEART is based on Broudy's theory of aesthetic appreciation (Broudy, 1977). Aesthetic education has as its goal the development of disciplined imagery (using all major art forms) through the refinement of perceptual skills.

Project HEART was developed outside of a school district by a community activist in Decatur who used her knowledge of the community and its organization to build a coalition of university personnel, community service agencies, and school personnel to design, carry out, and disseminate Project HEART to the schools. School administrators in Decatur and Champaign encouraged teachers to participate in the program as a means of providing comprehensive art education to students. In keeping with Broudy's approach a prominent feature of the Project HEART materials is the representation of major works of art and architecture within each of the three domains. These works of art are used both as conceptual foci for scanning and for making works of art. Reproductions of exemplary or classic works of art are the starting point for critical analysis with an emphasis on elements of design.

A common activity in Project HEART classrooms is the scanning of prints and slides. Scanning uses an interactive instructional approach. Students discuss points as a group and respond to questions posed by the teacher. Formal elements of design, subject matter or theme, artistic techniques, and expressiveness or mood are the categories of analysis. Students look for the object's sensory, formal, expressive, and technical properties. Polar pairs or adjectives are used to describe aspects of these properties, such as rough versus smooth.

Project HEART also has sought a high degree of articulation between art and general education. Through the technique of perceptual scanning, Project HEART teachers can use art and principles of aesthetic awareness to convey concepts and enhance learning in any subject area. For example, these techniques can be used in social studies classes to analyze the artifacts of different cultures.

In Project HEART classrooms, production activities are varied and cut across diverse mediums. Art history is emphasized considerably less than art making and analyses but will emerge on special instances, often as a reading or writing exercise. The continuity across grade levels and domains in the Project HEART curriculum is not yet strong; as a new and voluntary staff development program in the arts, Project HEART has not yet developed an aggregative continuity across grade levels.

BROOKLYN #15

Brooklyn #15 is one of 32 independent community school districts in New York City. It is a highly decentralized district, committed to school-site autonomy. Within Brooklyn #15, art enjoys strong support from the district's administration and Cultural Arts Supervisor and is highly visible throughout the district. Unlike the other study sites, however, Brooklyn #15 has no single, formalized art curriculum. Nor, in the opinion of district personnel, would such a curriculum be accepted in this setting. Instead, Brooklyn #15's art program is the sum of a large number of programs and activities, which combine to provide the students' art experiences.

Some of these programs are possible because of Brooklyn #15's proximity to exceptional cultural facilities. District programs with the Lincoln Center for the Arts and the Brooklyn Museum are examples. Other activities are the result of the district Art Supervisor's efforts to encourage art education incorporating the three domains through classroom visitations, lesson modelings, after-school workshops, and district-wide contests and art shows. In undertaking these activities, the Art Supervisor works from a base of 52 lesson plans that she had developed as a classroom teacher before becoming Brooklyn #15's Art Supervisor, along with the New York City and state art guides.

The teachers who provide art instruction in Brooklyn #15 are regular classroom teachers and "cluster teachers," whose function it is to cover classes during teachers' mandated preparation time. All but one of the district's 25 schools participate in Chapter 1, the federally supported compensatory education programs. These schools on average enjoy two to three cluster teachers each, because Brooklyn #15's agreement with the teachers' union requires five preparation periods per teacher per week in Chapter 1 schools (rather than the regular two). At all but one of the Title I schools, one of the cluster teachers has been designated an art teacher. Although not a trained specialist, without a district mandate for art, a designated art cluster teacher ensures that more Brooklyn #15 students are exposed to art education than would otherwise be possible.

The major emphasis in Brooklyn #15 is on art making. Art activities are directed toward highly visible contests and art shows. Art history is encouraged at the beginning of each year through a newsletter from the Art Supervisor to each of the schools and through the choice of yearly themes that emphasize history, such as Art Through the Ages, or The Treasures of New York. Criticism, however, has been more difficult to motivate and exists only as criticism of individual students' work and then only in a very few of the schools.

As might be expected, the type and quality of program activities in Brooklyn #15 are uneven across domains and schools and among and within grade levels. The causes of this unevenness lie directly in the autonomous nature of the district. Any continuity is a result of the Art Supervisor's efforts at coordination. Without a formalized written curriculum, coherence is introduced and encouraged through yearly themes around which the schools orient their art programs.

VIRGINIA BEACH

Virginia Beach, a suburban and resort community with a large military population, stretches for 65-plus miles along the Atlantic Coast. Art education is an integral part of the Virginia Beach City Public Schools' program. It enjoys strong support from the district superintendent on down through the teaching staff. It has developed a highly prescriptive, comprehensive K-12 curriculum followed with fidelity by the district's 68 art specialists. One

central office art coordinator oversees the program in the district's 59 elementary and secondary schools.

The NAEA guidelines provide the structure for the Virginia Beach art curriculum (National Art Education Association, 1968). This structure stresses five major components: perception and sensitivity, elements and principles of design, study of artists and works of art, critical evaluation of art, and the making of art. The elements and principles of design are the most central of these components and are used throughout Virginia Beach schools for describing the composition of works of art. Within these major components, activities are specified that incorporate the three domains and are, in turn, related to the program's major goals.

The desired student outcomes that are assumed to follow from experiences and activities in these five components are: a heightened awareness of self and sensitivity to the environment, an ability to express oneself visually, an ability to think creatively, a knowledge of cultural heritage, and an ability to make qualitative visual judgments. During a lesson, teachers typically first introduce the concepts, often through the use of artistic exemplars, and then have students experience these concepts by making their own "works of art." They ground the studio and criticism portions in the elements and principles of design. Activities related to criticism usually are embedded within other activities. Art history instruction enters the program through individual lessons or entire units devoted to a study of art and artists and incidentally through the use of works of art as a part of the introduction to studio projects.

There is a high degree of articulation between levels and concepts in Virginia Beach. Teachers know with assurance what students will have mastered at each preceding level. This discipline is carried out through careful specification of the content of Virginia Beach's art instruction. The major content areas are essentially the same in grades K-12. Students spiral through the content areas at each grade level; and at each new level, the content becomes broader and more complex. By the end of the program, students have been taught something about art as well as the making of art and have acquired artistic skills.

MILWAUKEE

The Milwaukee Public Schools have one of the largest school districts in the United States with an enrollment in 1983 that totaled about 85,000 students. Similarly to Whitehall, Milwaukee has a long history of art education. Art has been a part of the school district's curriculum for about 110 years. There are currently 49 high school art teachers, 32 middle school art teachers, and 14 art teachers assigned to elementary schools. At the elementary level, art is taught by the 14 art specialists in 24 of the district's 108 elementary schools. In the remaining 84 schools, art instruction is the responsibility of elementary classroom teachers under the supervision of the six supervising art teachers at the central office. At the 19 middle/junior high school sites, art is required at the 7th grade and becomes an elective at the 8th grade and thereafter. The high school level offers 23 art courses. Major leadership for art is provided by the district's Curriculum Specialist for art education and six supervising teachers of art.

In addition to the regular art program, Milwaukee operates numerous specialty schools that provide art though different models. These specialty schools, or magnets, were organized as a means of fostering racial integration throughout the district. Currently Milwaukee operates an elementary and middle school for the creative arts, an art museum satellite program, and a visual and performing arts high school, as well as several other specialty art programs.

Milwaukee subscribes to the theory that children learn best through "hands-on" experiences with art materials. Following the experimentalists' approach, children are seen as active learners who need to participate in experimentation, self-expression, and creative problem solving. This approach is also subscribed to in the conceptual approach called for in the Wisconsin state guides (Wisconsin Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1970 and 1973):

> Generalizations and concepts are not to be taught as words or facts *per se*. They should not be memorized but the student should arrive at them as discoveries through selected things, persons, events, processes and relationships. The learner should be encouraged to apply the concepts in different ways and in new situations.[4]

Following the structure of the state guidelines, the Milwaukee materials incorporate 15 concepts. In turn, the concepts embody the three domains. For example, the concepts "art enables us to understand our own and other cultures," and "societies communicate beliefs by developing visual symbols" both suggest numerous historical and critical art lessons.

The studio activities offered at many Milwaukee public schools are comprehensive and include those of the major art forms (for example, drawing, two-dimensional design, painting, and sculpture) common to most art curriculums as well as art forms found less often, such as architecture and costume design. Craft and commercial art forms as well as folk-art forms are also offered. The critical and historical content is on occasion presented in conjunction with studio activities. However, when this occurs there is often no sense of criticism and history as disciplines, worthy of study in their own right. In other lessons the disciplines of art history and criticism are prominent.

The Milwaukee curriculum materials are organized so that the 15 concepts are repeated in each grade and provide the basis for curriculum continuity. If the curriculum is implemented as outlined, a student who enters the Milwaukee public schools in kindergarten and attends regularly through sixth grade will experience 13 art lessons emphasizing each of the 15 art curriculum concepts. For the required 7th grade art course, the curriculum guide identifies four major conceptual areas for art experiences. At the high school level, an Arts Foundation course is a prerequisite for the 22 other art courses that constitute a system of beginning and advanced levels for each basic studio mode, such as painting and drawing. Thus, in Milwaukee those teaching the advanced art courses know that students have been exposed to certain concepts and skills in earlier lessons.

SUMMARY

In summary, of the seven programs studied, only two, in our estimation, were carried consistently into the classroom (see Table 2). The elementary generalist teachers in Hopkins and the elementary and secondary art specialist teachers in Virginia Beach achieved parity among the three domains in their teaching of art.[5] As evidenced in these districts, a discipline-based art program can be carried out by either the generalist classroom teacher or the specialist, at the elementary and the secondary level, and in a subset of a district's classrooms or across the district as a whole. In Champaign and Decatur, the generalist teachers who have been trained by Project HEART also are approaching parity, though emphasis on history trails the other two.

---

[4]Peters and Waterman, 1982, p. 6.

[5]Recall that we define parity to mean equality in terms of the status or value accorded each of the domains. Parity does not mean equal instruction time.

Table 2

THE EDUCATION EMPHASIS IN THE THREE DOMAINS

Domain	Hopkins	Virginia Beach	Champaign/ Decatur (Project HEART)	Milwaukee	Whitehall	Palo Alto (SPECTRA)	Brooklyn
Studio	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major	Major
History	Major	Major	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor
Criticism	Major	Major	Major	Minor	Minor	Insignificant	Insignificant

In our opinion, studio activities continue to dominate in Whitehall and Milwaukee, with classroom practices reflecting art history and criticism to a much lesser degree. In Palo Alto, after first setting the activity in a historical context, art making dominates each SPECTRA lesson, and art criticism plays an insignificant role. And in Brooklyn #15, students in art are exposed mainly to the making of art. Art history is introduced through the selection of yearly themes, and art criticism is insignificant. Yet influential personnel at each of the seven sites are advocates of discipline-based art education. Given this important interest and support, it is useful to examine what led to this diversity in outcomes. Therefore, the next sections examine the factors that contributed to or constrained the development of discipline-based art education programs in these seven sites.

III. INITIATION

The next three sections of this report examine the process of change in art education as it was evident in our study sites. Most analysts describe the change process in terms of three broad phases: initiation (or adoption), implementation, and institutionalization (or continuation).[1] These phases represent analytical constructs rather than the fluid reality of an art education program and its institutional setting. As such, they can oversimplify and "sterilize" the events under study because they can mask complexities such as the interactive influence of contextual variables; variable time frame; the shifting and substantially different roles of various actors in the process—central office administrators, school board members, teachers, community members and the like. Nonetheless, they are useful analytical devices because they direct attention toward the different aspects of each part of the change process as well as to major constraints. Each phase represents substantively different policy problems, engages somewhat different actors, and generates outcomes of different functional import. Looking at the process of change in this way emphasizes these phase-specific issues and highlights the interrelationships among factors associated with each phase.

This view of the change process also underscores the nonlinear and highly interdependent nature of major factors affecting the outcomes of local change efforts. Activities undertaken during the adoption phase will continue to influence project activities and prospects throughout the course of implementation. For example, have appropriate in-service education activities been planned? Is the technical assistance necessary for implementation available? Similarly, factors central to the institutionalization of program efforts—support for program materials and space requirements for example—must receive attention at the the outset of the change process, not once initial implementation efforts have been completed.

Many substantively different factors are influential at each stage; they shape not only the events of a particular phase but those of subsequent phases. In fact, choices and activities that occur in each phase establish important and sometimes immutable constraints on decisions that must be made farther down the road. One phase can feed back to transform plans or choices of a preceding phase. Absence of expected school board support for a new program during the institutionalization stage, for example, can force modification of earlier plans for incorporating practices into district routines.

Our seven sites illustrate the complexity of the process of change in art education; the multiple forms it can take; and how various factors work together to support or constrain goals of providing a substantively strong, sequential, and comprehensive art education program in the public school setting. The following sections treat the issues particular to each phase of the change process as they were evident at each site, examine the "outcomes" expected and objectives for each phase, and identify the factors associated with varying degrees of success in achieving these outcomes.

ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

The "initiation question" central to this study is two-fold. First, what motivates district administrators, teachers, or school board members to initiate a strong (or strengthened) art education program? By all reports, substantial district commitment to art education is excep-

[1]See Fullan, 1982.

tional, and local art education activities suffer "bias by neglect."[2] And if art education took a back seat during the halcyon days of expanding budgets, it is in an even more precarious position during a time of fiscal retrenchment.

But this study is concerned with more than the adoption of a substantial program in the visual arts. We are interested in art education activities that address the three domains of criticism, history, and the making of art. A second and equally difficult initiation question therefore is why some districts pursue art education of this stripe instead of the more conventional studio-based approach to the visual arts. This curricular choice breaks with certain traditional principles of education in the visual arts.[3]

The root issue for the initiation or adoption phase is support—commitment that translates into an effective program role for various actors in the education policy system and into the provision of the various resources necessary for implementation. Further, the literature on planned educational change makes it clear that isolated support, or support limited to particular locations within the school system, is inadequate. It suggests that more than just administrator commitment or teacher enthusiasm is necessary; effective planned change efforts typically have a broad base in the local education policy system and reflect wide agreement on the need for the program. At the district level, administrators and board members should see the program as contributing to the overall goals of the school district and as a legitimate use of scarce resources. Central office support is critical to the development of a stable, strong art education policy. Without it, scarce resources will not be allocated and art education will falter because it is not explicitly a part of established district priorities. Adoption of a new or modified art education program could occur without this express support, but the program's existence is likely to be tenuous and the signal sent to teachers and principals uncertain.

Central office support by itself is insufficient to a secure beginning for a new art education activity. At the school level, teachers and principals should understand and subscribe to the educational merit and methods of a program. Pro forma implementation is the probable result where school-level support is absent. The effective autonomy of teachers in their classroom has been documented consistently by studies of educational change.[4]

Community support is important too. Community attitudes shape school board member and central office administrator futures. Within the community, a new program effort must be seen as central to an education program and community-held values about broad educational goals. Again, although adoption certainly can (and often does) occur without this broader community engagement and approval, the longer term institutionalization needs of a new project underscore the importance of securing this support during the initial phase of project development. Without it, art advocates will provide lonely voices for the arts as district board members and administrators enter budget deliberation.

Because art education has little established brief in most communities, *active* support is required. A place for a strong art education program on a district, school, or community agenda is not inevitable. Art education has, as we have noted, suffered from "nondecisionmaking." The absence of "resistance" is insufficient to secure a billet for a strong art education program.

---

[2]Fullan (1982, p. 20) uses this term to describe a number of educational issues that failed to secure a place on district agendas simply for lack of effective interest and support.

[3]See, for example, Chapman, 1982, Chapter 1.

[4]See, for example, the review discussion on the point in William L. Boyd, "The Changing Politics of Curriculum Policymaking for American Schools," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 48, No. 4, Fall 1978, pp. 577–628.

The resources necessary for successful implementation include expertise to develop programs that incorporate components of history and criticism with instruction in production, allocation of time on the district and school schedules to carry out a substantive art education effort, the provision of adequate physical space, and monetary and human resources to train teachers and support their efforts. It is not enough simply to signal "permission" from the central office or principal's desk. Although many change efforts may require little more than administrative approval to commence—scheduling changes, for example—meaningful district adoption of art education as defined for this study requires allocation of fiscal, technical, and political resources.

All of the sites examined in this study faced these issues to some degree. Some districts had a more firmly established base of support for art education; some districts were further along than others in defining teacher and administrator expectations for a substantive, discipline-based art education program. Although adoption meant the initiation of a new program in some sites (e.g., Palo Alto and Brooklyn #15), in others it represented modification of existing policies (e.g., Virginia Beach and Whitehall), and Project HEART began from scratch outside the district educational structure. In Milwaukee, where art education has enjoyed strong support for more than a century, adoption per se was not at issue. The question for this district instead was one of continued maintenance and support for art education in the face of fiscal constraint and competing priorities.

Sites also differed in important ways in the factors that influenced adoption activities and the extent to which they effectively addressed adoption concerns. "Support" as well as the adoption "problem" thus took on substantively different meanings in each of our sites. Not surprisingly, the adoption "outcomes" evident in the seven sites—the level of support and resources directed at the art education effort—differed as well.

District administrators in all of our study sites were characterized as supportive of a strong art education program. But the level and nature of their involvement and their expressed commitment varied from an active partnership to "moral support" and mere approbation for the art education venture. In sites where central office support was essentially "benign," responsibility for marshaling resources for the art program of course was left to others. In districts where central office interest was more active, district administrators worked closely with program staff to secure and allocate the resources necessary for implementation.

Of the sites visited, Palo Alto had the least amount of *active* central office involvement. While district administrators believe art education is important to the education program, in Palo Alto, the center of energy for art education resides in the district's art consultant, who has planned the SPECTRA program and secured the resources necessary to carry it out. Assistance in carrying SPECTRA out comes from volunteers and a cadre of artists participating in the program. Central office support is evident in district policy statements but not in the active involvement of administrators or examination of the resources necessary to a strong art education program for elementary school youngsters. District support also is demonstrated by the fact that the art consultant position has been retained in the face of budget shortfalls generated by Proposition 13 (in stark contrast to most California school districts) and that a seven-period day has been continued, thereby allowing time for art education at the secondary level.

Support for art in Decatur and Champaign, the present sites at which Project HEART is active, also represents approbation more than active support, particularly as represented by allocation of district resources. District leaders in these two sites have offered more vocal and strategic assistance than was evident in Palo Alto. Administrators in Decatur and Champaign

have been limited in their support by the economic realities of their region. Decatur administrators have stressed HEART-oriented "developmental learner effectives," but community priorities and profound fiscal retrenchment preclude employing teachers already skilled in the needed pedagogy. In Champaign, a district that traditionally has maintained a strong commitment to the arts, serious budgetary shortfalls also preclude allocation of suitable resources for the arts, and forced discontinuation of all elementary art specialist positions. The district superintendent and Columbia School principal brought Project HEART to the new Columbia School magnet program with the hope of extending a similar teacher training program to other schools. The district paid for teacher training (a week-long summer institute plus four follow-up sessions), purchased Project HEART resources and paid staff members to attend the workshop. But the role of administrators in these economically pressed districts has essentially been confined to encouragement and assistance to the "cost-free" outsider, Project HEART. Most important, administrators in both cities enthusiastically offered time and space for Project HEART activities and encouraged teachers to participate in project training activities.

In Brooklyn, support from the central level also consists primarily of encouragement and strong signals that art is important. However, the former District #15 administrator made a structural change that has been essential to art activity in this district where schools retain substantial autonomy in setting instructional policy. He instituted the position of Cultural Arts Supervisor; this central office staff member has been extraordinarily effective in persuading schools to designate their discretionary position as the building's cultural arts specialist. Thus, at each school there is someone who has an explicit charge to support art education and who has a voice in the allocation of building level resources. This level of support for the arts is not seen in most of New York City's 32 community school districts. Indeed, given the political and fiscal limitations imposed on central office administrators in New York City, the Brooklyn #15's superintendent may have provided the maximum amount of possible support for the arts through the creation of a Cultural Arts Supervisor position.

In Milwaukee, central office support for art education consists of more than the district level cooperation and encouragement seen in Palo Alto, Project HEART, and Brooklyn. District administrator support of the arts is a tradition in Milwaukee, and officials support art education in multiple ways. In addition to the regular art education program, the district supports several model programs; a new city-wide high school of the arts is being planned. Top-level administrators enroll their children in the district's art-oriented programs and schools. They have agreed to open an art-oriented school in the midst of school closings and have spent discretionary dollars on art activities. They have publicly committed the district to retaining art supervisors despite recommendations to the contrary from a district consultant hired to plan the district's reorganization. This district level support has continued even in the face of considerable turbulence. The Milwaukee Public Schools have dealt with a federal desegregation order for more than a decade and are currently suing surrounding suburban school districts to force their assistance with the integration process, as has been done in St. Louis. Despite continuing strong district level support for art education, the expenses associated with a desegregation mandate has also forced cutbacks. The district has reassigned one of the central office art supervisors to a district-wide "effective schools" project, and it has eliminated funds to transport students to off-campus classes, including art. Thus the message Milwaukee's central office sends to schools about art is somewhat mixed—it is supported in principle, but it does not appear to be a central district goal at this time.

In the remaining three districts, central office administrators took an active and substantive role in initiating and developing the art education program. In contrast to Milwaukee's well-established art program, these districts all confronted development tasks. Whitehall district leaders promoted development to ensure the continued existence of art education in the face of a budget crisis. The district, which had a strong tradition of art education, faced a budget shortfall in 1977 and expected to request an increase in the school tax rate from voters soon. If the millage were to fail, the art specialist positions would be in jeopardy because there was no formal program in art education. District administrators thus actively encouraged art specialists to develop a course of study and to document the art program as a strategy for survival. To assist in this effort, the administration provided funds to support the curriculum writing task, assigned a secretary to program developers for two years, and permitted art teachers to attend workshops and conferences. Whitehall's art teachers say that the material and moral support given by central office administrators was crucial to the success of their efforts.

In Virginia Beach, art is considered one of the essentials. The district superintendent has been clear that art's status is unquestionable, and art is to display the same rigor and accountability expected in other curricular areas. Thus art education was assigned central office resources in terms of staff, release time support, technical assistance, and the institutional oversight associated with a "serious" educational activity.

In Hopkins, too, art education was included in general central office development and improvement initiatives. Art's centrality in an education program was unquestioned. Consequently, district leaders actively supported the development of an art education program through extensive in-service education resources, support for expert consultants, and insistence on a high-quality program effort.

FACTORS AFFECTING INITIATION

In securing the support and resources necessary to begin implementation or to sustain an existing art education effort, each site followed a unique process that was influenced not only by the site's setting and the individuals involved but also by features of the art education program undertaken. For example, generating support involved substantively different issues depending on whether the program was to use generalist teachers (as in Hopkins) or specialist teachers (as in Virginia Beach).

Despite the issues and processes particular to each site, three factors emerged across sites as central to the adoption outcomes we examined:

- The presence of an articulate arts advocate,
- Outside resources,
- Involvement strategies for teachers and administrators.

Presence of an Articulate Art Advocate

In most school districts, art education seldom receives serious consideration from policymakers or practictioners. Adoption of a strong art program requires an articulate advocate for art who can focus attention on the need for a substantive art education and mobilize the resources necessary to carry out such a program. Where support for a strong art program already exists in principle, the role of the art advocate is primarily substantive—diagnosing the problems in existing art education policies and suggesting steps for developing a serious instructional program in the arts.

Where this support does not exist—the case in most of the nation's school districts—the advocacy necessary to the adoption of a strong art program should be more than substantive. It needs to be expressly political. Indeed, political skills may be among the most important and the most neglected ingredients in carrying out the fundamental reforms in art education advocated by leaders in the field. By political skills we mean the ability to enlist support from disparate sections of the local education policy system and build coalitions to press for a strong art program in the schools. Because there is no effective organized constituency for art education (most parents and administrators remain to be convinced that the visual arts deserve a central place in the curriculum) and because art educators tend to isolate themselves from "mainline" institutional or political structures, political diplomacy takes on particular importance in art education.

The presence of such an individual was a critical factor in program development in all of our sites where adoption signaled a new commitment. Although these vocal art advocates certainly were not *sufficient* for successful adoption, their presence was essential in mobilizing the resources to develop an art education activity that differed from the crafty fare offered in most school districts.

These "prime movers" came from several locations—inside and outside the public school system and from the community. In Whitehall, art advocates emerged from the teaching staff. Two of the district's six art specialists became extraordinarily effective spokeswomen for developing a strong art education program. These teachers worked tirelessly to mobilize school board commitment to a substantial art education effort and engage the energy of district administrators. They were meticulous in ensuring that the art program and its products were constantly before the board and community and so were able to build a strong base of *informed* support for art education in this blue-collar Ohio community.

Palo Alto's most effective advocate is the district Art Consultant. She has been remarkably effective in establishing and nurturing ties with diverse segments of the community, in keeping parents informed and excited about art education in the schools, and in utilizing the considerable resources of nearby Stanford University to further or protect the position of art education in the district curriculum. By building a broad base of support, she has ensured continued attention to art education, even in a time of fiscal retrenchment.

Milwaukee's Curriculum Specialist for Art Education is another example of a strong art advocate that works from within the system. He provides the organization and leadership necessary to keep an art program the size of the Milwaukee program vital. As an active member in a large number of local and national organizations, the Curriculum Specialist for Art Education keeps abreast of events in art education and brings vision to the program, thus preventing its stagnation.

The advocacy central to Project HEART came from outside the participating school systems. A community activist used her knowledge of the community and its organization to build a coalition of university personnel, community service agencies, and school personnel to design and undertake an aesthetics-based visual arts education program. A Decatur parent, she marshaled resources from the state (Title IV-C innovative project grant) and from the Regional Superintendent's office to support Project HEART. She identified intellectual resources for the program and nurtured support networks throughout the region. Without her advocacy and effective organizational skills, the programs and activities represented by Project HEART would probably not have come to Decatur.

Brooklyn #15's Cultural Arts supervisor provides another example of well-developed political skills applied to building coalitions for art education. To engender community support

for art activities in the school, she capitalized on this community's desire to see demonstrations of their children's activities and has instituted a number of highly visible programs. For example, a district-wide art fair built around a particular theme is held each year. The supervisor actively encourages her contacts in the community and the private sector to support art activities materially and otherwise. Throughout the year local businesses are encouraged to display student art, sponsor art contests, and the like. This persistent and energetic attention to promoting arts in the schools has resulted in high visibility for the art program and has enhanced the morale of staff associated with the program.

Only in Hopkins and Virginia Beach did we see art programs developed without considerable previous coalition building. In these districts, the issue at hand was not support for art education per se, but substantive questions of development. This is because the Hopkins and Virginia Beach administrations took the lead in insisting on a substantive art education program. In Hopkins, administrator and board interest in a strong art education program had been tabled until substantive concerns could be satisfied. The individual who catalyzed district attention and resources for art education was a parent. The district had long recognized the need for an art education program, but when their first attempt to build such an effort in the late 1960s failed (the art coordinator hired to develop the program was unable to assume the position), the district moved on to other things. In the late 1970s, a parent and practicing artist became an advocate for a substantive, discipline-based art curriculum. She mobilized school board commitment to a strong art education program and willingness to provide the resources for program development and staff training.

In Virginia Beach, too, it was assumed that the district would have a sustantive art education program. At issue was the need to formulate a curriculum guide, similar to that found in other academic areas. The district devoted considerable funds to support the development of an art curriculum guide, underwriting the costs of summer teacher workshops and stipends for the group of art teachers who worked with two different art supervisors to produce the district's art curriculum. In 1977 a 200 page K-12 guide was developed. During subsequent summers, four additional detailed guides were developed at the district expense. Milwaukee, too, has devoted considerable effort to the development of curriculum guides and materials. District staff have produced seven graded elementary guides; ten secondary level guides; six television guides; and separate guides for art education activities in reading, environmental education, and art history, for example.

Outside Resources

Outside resources in the forms of money and expertise played an important part in the initiation of six of the seven art education programs we examined. Outside funds were crucial to Project HEART. The project director applied successfully for support from Title IV-C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a state-administrated federal program that provides funds for innovative projects. Without the approximately $250,000 grant awarded to it over a three year period, Project HEART would not have come into being. No local funds were available for the project.

Palo Alto's SPECTRA program drew heavily on outside funds for its initiation and support. A small grant from the San Mateo Foundation (now the Peninsula Community Foundation) provided start-up funds for the project. Shortly thereafter (January 1981), Bank of America awarded Palo Alto $7500 to fund the project for a full year. In the spring of 1981, the California Arts Council and the State Department of Education jointly offered $750,000 to

school districts to develop exemplary programs in art education. Palo Alto's Art Consultant applied and the district was awarded funding for two years, $20,000 and $31,000 respectively.

In Virginia Beach, outside funds were an important stimulus. Virginia Beach's first art specialists were hired in 1966 with Title I funds. This federal program provided for four art teachers as well as for other specialists and resources in the district's four black schools. The district argued the merit of hiring specialists in these schools on the grounds of the students' cultural deprivation. To make up for that, additional specialized resources were acquired. The art programs developed with Title I funds generated demand by white parents that similar programs operate in their children's schools too. Although district respondents believe that Virginia Beach would have had an art program without the experience of this Title I project, they doubt whether the strong specialist model currently in place would have come to pass. The Title I activities demonstrated the merit of this approach to art education.

Outside funds played a less central but nonetheless important role in Milwaukee. District funds have supported the regular art education efforts for over 100 years. However, federal funds provided through the Emergency School Assistance Act (ESAA) supported new program efforts in the district. Under a 1976 court order to desegregate the schools, Milwaukee initiated a system of magnet schools. Several innovative art programs were established as a part of this strategy. ESAA funding for this activity was generous. On the average, magnet schools received three extra staff members and additional funds for in-service training, supplies, and equipment. In the 1977–1978 school year, for example, the elementary arts magnet school received $71,500 in additional funds through ESAA. District officials doubt that the present, fairly well-developed special art education activities could have been put in place without this outside federal support.

In addition to funding, outside expertise was a critical external factor in four of the programs we examined. University-based experts were central to the development of programs in Palo Alto, Hopkins, Project HEART, and Whitehall. Stanford's Elliot Eisner has long been active in stimulating support for art education in Palo Alto's public schools and has been available to the district's art consultant as a source of ideas and feedback. Eisner has been important to both the substance and the position of art education in this district.

The role of university experts was even more central to adoption and development in Hopkins and Project HEART. The Hopkins program was developed largely by a University of Minnesota Professor of Art Education; an art student from the university provided in-service education for Hopkins teachers. The group of Hopkins staff responsible for developing the district's curriculum model examined many existing models and concluded that they weren't going to get anything that would really fit. Consequently, they enrolled in Margaret DiBlasio's course in Curriculum Innovations in Art Education at the University of Minnesota and attempted to develop a curriculum as a class project. However, they soon found that they didn't have the theoretical framework to look at a conceptual art framework; in response, the district hired DiBlasio as a consultant to advise development efforts.

Project HEART drew heavily on University of Illinois's intellectual resources. Harry Broudy was the inspiration and intellectual source for the Project; Associate Professor Carol Holden who was teaching courses in Broudy's methods provided extensive guidance to Project HEART developers both as the instructor in the methods and theory course that led to project development and as consultant and booster as development proceeded.

For these three sites, university-based art education faculty provided critical inspiration, expertise, and encouragement. Whitehall staff received these same resources from the Ohio State Education Agency. Ohio traditionally has had one of the country's best developed art

curricula and program guides. Jerry Tollifson, the individual responsible for much of the recent developmental work on the prize-winning Ohio art guides, shared materials with Whitehall and spent a great deal of time in the district working with staff to develop the Whitehall art program.

In all of these districts the availability of outside resources of funds and expertise provides a partial answer to the two-fold adoption question treated by this study—Why do some districts adopt a substantive and serious approach to art education and what factors foster art education that is discipline-based, sequential, and attentive to history, criticism, and production? For these programs, outside funds, expertise, and energy are important resources in defining art education policies consistent with the views represented in this study.

Principal and Teacher Involvement

It is ironic that the attitudes and interests of teachers and principals—obviously the key actors in any school-based program—often are overlooked in the initial phase of program adoption. Enthusiastic project directors seem to assume that principals and teachers will instantly share their enthusiasm; central office administrators often act as though central office directives are self-winding. Experience has shown that both assumptions seriously misrepresent school-level response to "great ideas" or directives from outside. Many teachers and principals appear to be indifferent, if not actively resistant, to efforts imposed on their schools and classrooms without their previous involvement or without opportunities for making a program their own.

The three districts in our study that achieved a high level of district-wide teacher and principal commitment to the new art programs—Hopkins, Whitehall, and Virginia Beach—all emphasized involvement as an important activity during the adoption phase. Hopkins, for example, provided extensive in-service education for every principal, teacher, counselor, physical education specialist, and music specialist. These sessions elaborated the need for a strong art component in the instructional program and provided, as the superintendent put it, "a personal exploration in their own self-expression . . . to get people excited about something that could be." In addition, district administrators expressly tried to keep the school board and the principals informed as development proceeded. "Concurrently with development we were working with the Board of Education and the elementary principals, telling them what we were about and how we were proceeding. They were feeling very current. When it came time to implement, it wasn't—'What is this?'" By the time implementation began, staff members in Hopkins were uniformly supportive of the effort and in agreement about the importance of art education.

In Whitehall and Virginia Beach, teachers who would ultimately be responsible for implementing the program were central figures in planning and development. Teachers in these districts point to the high level of ownership achieved in this process and their consequent willingness to expend the extra effort necessary to make the program work. Even in Virginia Beach, where staff size precluded the involvement of everyone, teachers report that the fact they were central to development was sufficient to extend this sense of ownership to all of the district's art staff.

In Milwaukee, where art education comprised innovative efforts as well as the ongoing traditional program, teacher and principal involvement took on a different cast. In the magnet schools, efforts similar to those in Hopkins and Virginia Beach were made to socialize teachers and principals. For the regular art program, involvement was less intense and more routine.

For example, both generalist and specialist teachers were involved in writing curriculum and focused in-service education programs. Principals saw slide presentations on the art education program in 1978 and 1982; central office staff viewed a similar program in 1983. In addition, art supervisors meet every day with principals in four or five different schools to discuss art programs and problems.

In Brooklyn #15, the adoption issue is substantively different because there is no specified "program" that principals and teachers were expected to carry out. Instead, the emphasis was on making art education available in all of the district's schools. To that end, the Cultural Arts supervisor expended vast amounts of energy on the factor central to success: encouraging schools to allocate their discretionary position (the "cluster teacher") to the arts. She visited regularly with principals and school staff to lobby for art education, stir up interest in various projects, and garner the active commitment of school administrators and staff. Because there was no prescribed district art program in Brooklyn, whether an art effort was carried out at all depended on adoption support.

The SPECTRA program addressed the involvement of generalist teachers by means of a written agreement. Teachers who wanted a SPECTRA teacher in their classroom filled out a request form, which stressed the in-service education goals of the project and required teachers to sign an understanding that they would "take the leadership in teaching one of the 18 lessons, with help and hand-holding as needed, by my SPECTRA artist."[5] A cover memo to elementary principals also emphasized that the SPECTRA purpose was to serve as an in-service training program and "teachers are expected to improve their capabilities in teaching art by attending to the lessons—not catching up on paperwork, etc."

Elementary school principals in Palo Alto have not taken an active role in the SPECTRA program as they have in Hopkins, Virginia Beach, and Whitehall. The Art Consultant is conscientious in stopping by the principal's office when she visits a school and keeping principals informed about SPECTRA activities, but the principals' knowledge about and engagement in the program differ considerably. Some principals are therefore much more enthusiastic and active supporters of the art education efforts of classroom teachers than others. However, there is a high level of principal support for the general goals of the SPECTRA program. Indeed, principal support for the program was critical to SPECTRA's beginning. At the initial stage of program development, elementary school principals helped provide start-up money from their own school cash reserves. In the view of the Art Consultant, without this support, subsequent foundation funding would not have been possible.

Conclusions

The substantially different adoption activities, local contexts and traditions, and strategic objectives generated considerably different adoption activities and outcomes in our study sites. Several factors appear particularly important to the two-fold adoption question with which we began—why do some districts adopt strong, substantive art education programs and why do some districts break with tradition to pursue a visual arts education that incorporates the domains of criticism, history, and production?

One factor is the expressly political nature of the process and the importance of networks or coalitions to support and nurture art education. Because art has an uncertain position in the public school curricula (or in the training of education personnel), networks to support art education should be "extra-system"—they must tap and mobilize interests and political suasion

[5]Memorandum of May 21, 1982, from Kay Alexander to teachers of grades 3/4.

outside the formal district structure. Helco (1978) calls such configurations "issue networks" or "webs of influence to provoke and guide the exercise of power."

> Issue networks (unlike subgovernments which presume small circles of participants who have succeeded in becoming largely autonomous) comprise a large number of participants within quite variable degrees of mutual commitment or dependence on others in their environment; in fact it is almost impossible to say where network leaves off and its environment begins.[6]

Issue networks may or may not be mobilized into a coalition (or shared-action) group. However, art advocates in our study sites were remarkably effective in doing just that. They identified these art issue networks and mobilized them into an effective support system for art education at their site.

These coalitions then must examine the incentives central to district administrators, board members, and teachers—namely, community or parent demands, district reputation, and professional concerns about the quality of classroom instruction. Palo Alto's Art Consultant, Milwaukee's Curriculum Specialist, and Project HEART's originator were master strategists in this regard. They identified and developed broad and politically consequential lines of support throughout the community, region, and state. They presented the project to teachers in a way that secured their support. Project HEART was particularly attentive to the question of professional incentives for teachers. All three advocates eliminated major bureaucratic disincentives by securing outside funding that was necessary for the project's development. These advocates, in other words, used their political skills to create the structure of extraordinary support and collegiality that is both absent in the formal district structure and exceedingly difficult to create from whole cloth. They mobilized the fiscal, intellectual, and practical resources to deliver the goods.

A second and related feature is the importance of outside resources to both the adoption and the development of the art education programs we examined. In particular, the contribution of outside intellectual or conceptual resources was striking. University experts played a major role in most of our sites as they *worked with* local developers, helping them translate theory into practice. These projects represented some of the first attempts (to our knowledge) to make concrete the models of art education recommended in books and journals. And this collaboration between university-based experts and local educators was the result of practitioner inquiry and request, not professorial initiative. The interplay between theory and practice in the curriculum and practitioner need for assistance with the theoretical principles underlying program development is evident in Whitehall. Although Tollifson from the Ohio State Education Agency played a major conceptual and intellectual role in Whitehall's program development activities, in our view he had less responsibility for concrete aspects of development than was necessary to guide local choices. Whitehall's teacher-developers assumed responsibility for translating theory into practice. They acknowledge the uneven theoretical grasp among district art teachers and the resulting uneven implementation. They believe that an "incomplete understanding of the theories" underlying the excellent Ohio guide led to "watered-down" practice as well as activities inconsistent with the precepts central to their approach.

Our study sites suggest a pivotal role for university-based experts in promoting and defining local art education activities that address the three domains. However, they also indicate that a productive practitioner-theoretician relationship will be substantively and structurally different from the typical association between the field and academe. Our study sites suggest

[6]Helco, 1978, p. 102.

an active role for university-based experts in elaborating the implications of their theories for classroom practice.

A third noteworthy factor that emerges from the adoption experience of our seven districts is the nontraditional role played by the district art coordinator. Traditionally, central office art consultants have been responsible for developing the art curriculum, overseeing school level efforts to implement it, and generally serving as arbiter about the nature and limits of acceptable practice. In Hopkins, Palo Alto, Virginia Beach, Brooklyn #15, and Project HEART, the art consultant (or project director) functioned as facilitator and broker rather than director or manager in the traditional sense. This shift in role not only calls for different skills on the part of the art consultant—particularly political skills—but also casts teachers responsible for art education in a different role. They had been primarily recipients of central office directives under a traditional model, but they now take a much more active role in deciding what should be taught and how. The art consultant, in important respects, functions to service these teacher decisions. The result is a high level of teacher involvement and ownership in the art curriculum and an effective use of limited art consultant energy and talent.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION

ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

Once plans have been developed for an art education program, teachers confront the task of carrying them out. Even though art programs differ in content and focus, the central implementation task is similar: Teachers must learn the methods, routines, and subject matter necessary to provide instruction as anticipated by project planners.

Two major outcomes signal successful implementation: teacher confidence and demonstrated ability. Across participating schools, successful implementation is characterized by high and consistent quality in classroom practices and by activities that are consistent with program goals.[1] A successfully implemented program will be coherent.

In addressing the central implementation task—teacher learning—all art education programs face similar broad implementation issues. For one, the "technology" of art education is indeterminate and underdeveloped. Art has little agreed-on curriculum and few standard prescriptions. Programs of the type examined in this study have even less in the way of substantive guidance. Although there is little virtue in a single view, to be sure, the implementation task faced by our seven sites was largely developmental and lacked established precedent.

A related issue involves the nature of the learning task in programs of the type we examined. Many generalist teachers lack confidence in providing instruction in history, criticism, and production. For most classroom teachers, this means more than simply learning new content and methods; it means overcoming such beliefs as "the teaching of art requires a special talent" and "art is little more than recreational activity for the end of a busy week." The learning necessary for implementation comprises the difficult task of assimilating a new perspective on the role of art education, mastering the content appropriate to its purposes, and understanding the philosophy central in the approach.

The learning task facing specialist art teachers is no different. Although specialist teachers are comfortable in the art instructional role, like their generalist colleagues, most of them also need to gain new skills in the areas of history and criticism and to modify their views about the nature and place of art in the curriculum. There are many reasons why the view of art education taken in this study has not achieved broader application in the schools:

> Even in secondary schools, many teachers are still reluctant to teach history or develop skills in critically analyzing art. This lack of enthusiasm can be traced, in part, to the fear that students will want to copy the styles of other artists, rather than to be inventive. Some teachers, again, have had little training in critically analyzing art, or they may have had such dull art history courses in college that they shy away from this area.[2]

In short, carrying programs of the type examined here is a learning problem of the highest order.

Implementation outcomes in our seven sites ranged from a high level of teacher learning and consistent practice to uneven or uncertain practices in participating classrooms. Through

---

[1]Student outcomes are, of course, another important result of implementation. However, they are not to the point of this analysis because they may or may not relate to the quality of implementation. Our concern here is with the task of carrying out an adopted practice. The pedagogical merit of the practice is the subject of another analysis.

[2]Chapman, 1982, p. 35.

their participation in the project, Project HEART teachers achieved a substantial if elementary conceptual approach to art. These generalist teachers expressed comfort with their new role as art educator and the philosophical position represented by Harry Broudy's notion of art education and the role of perceptual skills in general education. They saw that they had something to teach. Classroom visits showed that some teachers, of course, had incorporated the principles more fully than others and some were more skillful in carrying them out. But the visits also showed that Project HEART classrooms were consistently distinguishable from others. Overall, the level and quality of implementation in this project is high.

In terms of district-wide programs, Virginia Beach and Hopkins show the highest level of consistency across classrooms, in both the quality of classroom instruction and the activities associated with program guidelines and objectives. Students in these districts are exposed to essentially the same concepts and sequence of activities regardless of their classroom assignment. Although teacher strategies for addressing program goals vary, the basic instructional program is reflected consistently in classrooms across the district, and teachers express confidence in their ability to meet program objectives. Implementation in Hopkins and Virginia Beach must be judged highly successful.

Whitehall, we believe, has been somewhat less effective in implementing their new art program. The general quality of instruction in the visual arts is high, but there is unevenness in how much Whitehall teachers address the three domains. Some teachers approximate parity among criticism, history, and production; in other classrooms, instruction is dominated by studio activities. In terms of overall quality, Whitehall's implementation has been successful. Achieving program practices that are consistent with broad project goals and philosophy has been less so.

Similar unevenness exists in Milwaukee. Here, however, unevenness appears to extend to the quality of classroom practices as well. In some classes, students received what would be judged high quality art education by any standard; in other classes, art instruction appears removed from the substantive, concept-based activity described in district policy statements. Practices in Milwaukee also vary in terms of the amount of time teachers spend on art education. When asked how many minutes they teach art on the average per week, 105 respondents indicated a range of art instruction time from 10 minutes to 150 minutes, with the average response of 68 minutes. Although this represents more time devoted to art than is the case in most districts, it is below district allotted times.

In Palo Alto and Brooklyn, outcomes are variable both in quality and consistency. Brooklyn, in many respects, is a special case. Because there was no prescribed district program or coherent special project activity, the implementation analysis applied to the other sites is inappropriate here. In Brooklyn, implementation tasks generally did not comprise new learning as in other districts. The primary task involved supporting the efforts of "cluster teachers" to provide art education activities. Because of the district's policy of school-level decentralization and commitment to school-site autonomy, no systematic attempt to bring substantive or procedural consistency to individual teacher efforts would have been acceptable.

In Palo Alto, generalist teachers participating in the program are better equipped than before to provide instruction in the visual arts. The president of the district's elementary principals' association wrote that classroom teachers "have gained in their understanding and appreciation of art, their knowledge of art heritage, their ability to teach a classroom significant art lessons using techniques and methods which they learned through the SPECTRA pro-

gram."[3] Despite these clear absolute gains, however, the level of teacher proficiency and interest is highly variable. Some teachers seem excited about the skills and insights SPECTRA artists brought into their classrooms; others appeared less interested. SPECTRA represents an extraordinarily inventive effort to bring concrete demonstration of art education principles and practices into the classroom, but the extent of teacher commitment largely reflects individual teacher interest in art education or sense of priority for arts in the elementary curriculum.

FACTORS AFFECTING IMPLEMENTATION OUTCOMES

Each site we studied had its own particular "implementation path," as local factors and activities undertaken during the adoption phase conspired to produce a situationally unique outcome. Despite these local features, the implementation outcomes associated with individual projects share certain broad explanatory factors:

- Concrete, ongoing training,
- Well-specified instructional goals,
- Centralized coordination.

None of these factors stands alone as important to ensure successful implementation. They function together as components of that strategy that underlies effective implementation efforts.

Concrete, Ongoing Training

Concrete, ongoing training is important to the consistent and confident provision of art education by generalist teachers. The function of in-service education or training for regular classroom teachers is to assist in the complex task of learning and integrating a new point of view about responsibilities for art education and the philosophical position represented in a program that incorporates art history, criticism, and production.

Most teachers have been led to see art education as a specialist enterprise, like physical education or music. Thus, art instruction is something left to the specialist, or, if required of the regular classroom teacher, confined to "fun" production activities.

For generalist teachers, learning to provide art education of the type examined here is multi-faceted—learning a new role with regard to art education, learning about the concepts that underlie an approach to art education, learning that one can acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to a quality instruction in art history, criticism, and production. Learning of this nature is a complex task that cannot be accomplished through a weekend or after school workshop here and there. It requires training that allows participants to learn in increments geared to a level of conceptual sophistication and to actual classroom practice.

Programs that aim to train generalist teachers to provide art education must alleviate the fear of incompetent performance in an "alien" instructional area. The *concrete* aspects of in-service education take on particular importance in this case.

Project HEART, Palo Alto's SPECTRA program, and Hopkins illustrate three ways in which this concrete training can be provided. Project HEART and SPECTRA used trained artists to provide hands-on demonstration to generalist teachers. Project HEART offered many opportunities for classroom teachers to try out activities and practice new scanning skills

[3]Letter from James E. Mathiott, March 13, 1984.

in "safe" workshop environments. Teachers were urged to introduce these new skills immediately in their classrooms; project resource staff visited frequently to provide support and feedback for these implementation efforts. Teachers were thus able to try out new ideas under the eye of trusted experts. Further, teachers were urged to present the ideas as soon as possible in their classroom; project staff visited to comment and offer assistance.

SPECTRA approached the problem somewhat differently, providing concrete experience through the activities of a SPECTRA artist in a project teacher's classroom. Generalist teachers were able to see how SPECTRA techniques were received by their own students and in the context of their own classroom. This strategy anticipates a frequent teacher reaction to demonstrations of new practices: "That's nice, but it won't work for my kids." However, the concreteness of the SPECTRA program did not extend to classroom teacher engagement. The classroom teacher role in SPECTRA generally is that of observer. Although SPECTRA represents a promising idea in principle, the present modest schedule of "supervised rehearsal"—one complete lesson each semester—may be insufficient to build confidence for many teachers.

Hopkins paid explicit attention to the need for teachers to have regular support and feedback during the implementation phase. In Hopkins, a group of pilot teachers—approximately seven per school—received extensive training in each unit of the curriculum they would be responsible for carrying out. The Elementary Art Specialist visited each classroom at least once every two weeks to observe instructional activities, give demonstration lessons, and provide assistance as needed. The result was a tailored, "hands-on" training component for the pilot teachers. These teachers then were able to provide ongoing assistance and practical support as the rest of the elementary teachers participated in similar training the following year. With this peer assistance, the Elementary Art Specialist was able to target her classroom assistance and observation on classrooms of greatest need.

Milwaukee also attended to the training needs of generalist and specialist teachers but used the more traditional in-service education approach of special workshops and district-wide in-service sessions. For example, in the past ten years, 35 eight-session in-service workshops were provided for more than 700 elementary generalists. Art specialists have participated in numerous workshops in specific areas such as sculpture and art heritage.

Brooklyn, too, relied on the more traditional in-service education approach. Workshops, demonstrations, and expert consultants were available to teachers. Yet, even though the Cultural Arts Supervisor focused considerable attention in training on issues of "consistency," there was substantial diversity in the classroom. In the absence of systematic training on a common curriculum, teachers carried out art education depending largely on their own background and interests.

Specialist teachers pose learning or staff development problems similar to their generalist colleagues, but the experience of our study sites suggests that these needs can be met effectively with somewhat different strategies. Specialists schooled in studio techniques need training in art history and criticism to carry out the programs pursued in this study. Like their generalist colleagues, specialist teachers need to understand and incorporate a changed approach to instruction and conceptual framework for art education. For most specialists, this learning task is just as complex and difficult as the one confronting generalist teachers. There is an important difference, however.

Unlike generalist teachers, specialists are at home in the role of art educator and have a common language and technology that can facilitate acquisition of a new approach to art education. Specialists may have less need for support in their role than generalist teachers, and

the intensive, hands-on experience that was effective for generalist teachers may not be necessary for specialist staff. As we discuss below, local materials development supported much of the conceptual learning necessary for specialist teachers; practical learning could occur in less frequent workshops or through visits of central office staff. However, training was still critical to specialist teachers.

Well-Specified Instructional Framework and Goals

A central question for this study was whether a "core" or "common" art education curriculum was either possible or desirable. Some believe that such a policy is inconsistent with the spirit and fact of art education where creativity, spontaneity, and individual interpretation are valued. A common curriculum, they fear, depresses these features and leads to mediocre, desultory visual arts instruction.

The experience of our study sites indicates that fear is unfounded: It is possible to have a common or core art curriculum and still maintain a high level of vitality and creativity in program activities. The importance of a well-specified instructional framework and clear goals can best be understood in terms of the implementation task facing teachers in these programs.

Implementation of a new routine—save those in which adoption constitutes implementation (e.g., a new public address system) or those in which adoption contains all the information necessary to implementation (e.g., a new speed limit)—is a two-step process. The first step involves learning what to do to get along—the rules of the game. What are central expectations? What are the parameters of acceptable behavior? The second step involves learning how to do better, how to identify and carry out more effective activities within the boundaries of the rules.

For teachers to move to the second step of implementation in an indeterminate area such as art education where there is no "best practice" that can be transmitted or replicated faithfully, they must be clear about expectations and the rules of the game. Before teachers can proceed confidently to issues of program development and improvement, they want to understand the objectives guiding classroom practice and acceptable teacher performance. Teachers want to know what is expected of them. Especially for generalist teachers, clearly specified goals and instructional parameters provide a needed "floor" for art education activities.

This feature of the curriculum was most striking in Hopkins and Virginia Beach. In Hopkins, generalist teachers appreciated the prescriptive nature of their curriculum materials on the belief that "even if a classroom teacher has little art background or lacks confidence, he or she can still do an acceptable job of teaching art by following the lesson description in detail." This generalist teacher view is not altogether surprising. The strong support voiced by Virginia Beach's specialist teachers, however, is somewhat less expected. These are precisely the teachers many feared would be suppressed, frustrated, or constrained by a specified core curriculum. Yet an overwhelming majority of them surveyed as part of this study (90 percent) either agreed or strongly agreed that "it's good to have supervisors and administrators who see to it that the curriculum is being followed." Seventy-six percent of the art teachers agreed or strongly agreed that "when teachers don't follow the curriculum guides, it is detrimental to an art program," and 90 percent agreed or strongly agreed that "the art curriculum guides in this district are probably the best in the country."

The requirement that all Virginia Beach teachers follow the curriculum guides and that they prepare detailed unit and daily lesson plans has resulted in an extremely high level of professionalism within the staff. Consequently, in the assessment of Brent Wilson,

> The quality of instruction across the domains is just about as high as it can be. Any problems relating to quality of instruction lie more with the curriculum than with the teachers; they have been helped to teach very well. And because of the unified approach to careful planning and the dedicated following of the guides, a high quality of instruction is found across grades, levels, and schools.[4]

Somewhat counterintuitively, Virginia Beach teachers, even those who originally had opposed the curriculum's uniform requirements and structure, characterize their guides as "liberating" and as providing a structure in which they can confidently proceed in their own style. In retrospect, these specialists see the *absence* of a well-specified guide as a constraint to creative teaching.

Teacher creativity aside, it was evident that implementation outcomes varied directly with level of specificity. Whitehall and Milwaukee both have fairly comprehensive guides, yet they both contain areas that generate teacher uncertainty and thus variability in the level and quality of classroom practice. In Whitehall, whereas curriculum materials are well-developed, the program *structure* is not. When curriculum planning was done and the curriculum materials developed, teachers expressed a wish to maintain their autonomy, to "retain their personal styles." As a result, after five years, classroom practice is uneven and there appears to be little coherence among schools and classrooms. Each teacher operates independently, discarding materials and adding others at will.

In Milwaukee, the structure is clear to teachers—the sequence of activities and objectives—but strategies for meeting them are not specified. Milwaukee's curriculum, by design, only broadly identifies implementation strategies and instructional activities. This approach is consistent with the program's philosophical base. Variability in quality and type of instruction is predictable, given the curriculum foundation of an experimentalist model, where teachers are able to arrive at concepts or goals through whatever means they determine. It is not entirely unexpected that Milwaukee teachers use their guides far less than do their counterparts in Hopkins and Virginia Beach. When asked how often they used their guides, 18 percent said "often," 56 percent answered "occasionally," 18 percent responded "seldom," and 8 percent said "never." There is little emphasis on learning of particular bits of information or facts in the curriculum. Although the "floor" seen in Virginia Beach and Hopkins is not apparent in Milwaukee, the district's experimentalist approach also supports invention. Because of the amount of freedom that art teachers enjoy, together with the guidance provided by the written curriculum, classroom instruction in the visual arts exhibits what Michael Day judges to be a high degree of fruitful innovation.[5] Milwaukee, in effect, has sacrificed the uniform level of implementation seen in Hopkins or Virginia Beach to encourage individual teachers to experiment within broad district guidelines. This philosophy has generated unevenness, but it has also promoted innovative, high quality, and exciting art education activities in district classrooms.

Central Coordination

Central coordination can play an important role in the level and quality of program implementation. A coordinator who visits classrooms regularly can evaluate the developmental needs of the program on an ongoing basis, work to assure a consistent standard of practice across classrooms, target technical assistance resources, and provide support for teacher efforts. The coordinators we observed managed by regular and informal communication. Classroom

[4]Personal communication.

visitations of this nature are a major part of program strategy in Hopkins, Virginia Beach, Palo Alto, and Project HEART.

A central coordinator also plays a critical role in identifying program materials, circulating them among teachers and schools, and ensuring that the necessary resources are available for teachers. Milwaukee, for example, has an extensive system of instructional television art programs and a well-stocked art resource room available to its teachers. This facilitative function appears particularly important in maintaining the quality of art education programs that address the three domains. Locating and preparing the prints, texts, films, and other materials required by a strong art curriculum is an extraordinarily time consuming task and one that requires considerable expertise, which may exceed that of generalist teachers assigned responsibility for art education. And both generalist and specialist teachers comment that the amount of time necessary to collect and organize art resources on their own is often unavailable. For example, Project HEART teachers as well as Virginia Beach's specialist teachers comment that without someone to bring new materials to their attention and provide an array of resources to use in structuring their programs, they would tend to rely on a fairly static pool of resources. The vitality of program activities thus would be diminished.

Michael Day noted that the role of elementary art specialist as "curriculum innovator" is an important innovation responding directly to the character of programs addressing the three domains.[6] Elementary art specialists most often become itinerant art teachers who move from classroom to classroom with "art on a cart" or, if they are fortunate, have their own art room where groups of students are brought by their regular teachers to receive art instruction. Very few districts, in Day's view, have the type of sequentially organized prescriptive art curriculum seen in Hopkins; requirements to implement this kind of curriculum would alter the specialist's role to become considerably more than a person who demonstrates art studio projects and the use of diverse art materials.

Conclusion

The strategies that appeared most effective in treating the main implementation problem—teacher learning—had several interrelated features in common. First, some mechanism was available to direct teacher attention toward the requirements and needs of the art education program. Written art curricula and instructional guides were the mechanisms used in all but one of our study sites.

Second, coupled with a mechanism to focus teacher attention on the requirements and needs of the art education program were signals from district administrators that teacher implementation efforts will be observed and supported. In Decatur and Champaign, the sites for Project HEART, administrators signaled at least approbation by offering district classrooms as sites for Project HEART activities and encouraging teachers to participate in Project HEART training. They indicated affirmative support for the arts in a time when art specialists were all but eliminated, by the establishment of art magnet schools, enrollment of their children in these art-focused schools, and emphasis on staff development in art education. The Hopkins administration demonstrated support through its extensive, district-wide program of in-service training in art. The Virginia Beach administration underscored its support for teacher implementation of the art education program by a well-supported curriculum development process and a clear expectation that teachers would adhere to the guides.

[5]Personal communication.
[6]Personal communication.

In other sites, however, the signals from district administrators were mixed. For example, in Milwaukee, teacher in-service in art is not required. Yet district administrator support for the arts is a tradition, and officials continue to support art in other ways. The signal sent to Milwaukee teachers about art, therefore, is mixed and, where strong teacher interest does not exist, probably diverts teachers' attentions from the requirements and needs of Milwaukee's art education program.

Third, effective implementation strategies also were characterized by what Peters and Waterman call "simultaneous loose-tight properties."[7] Objectives and implementation requirements for the art education program were clearly and consistently communicated to teachers, yet within this "tight" structure there was considerable room for individual teacher discretion and style. Programs that manifested these "loose-tight" properties (Hopkins and Virginia Beach) established a "floor" of acceptable art education activities without precluding teachers from "reaching further," or innovating.

A fourth feature of effective implementation was express attention to the complex nature of the learning task and its *affective* correlates— that is, the emotional and psychological components of the change process. The successful in-service education efforts observed in this study did not frame the task simply in terms of technological mastery. The regular feedback, concrete assistance, and opportunities for building teacher confidence seen in Project HEART and Hopkins, for example, are notable in their attention to the different rates at which teachers understand and incorporate new materials and concepts and the considerable amount of personal change involved in moving to this model of art instruction. Teachers who appeared less comfortable than others with the new concepts might receive additional support through extra demonstration lessons, special materials, or simply encouraging feedback. When the learning necessary for implementation goes beyond the acquisition of new technical skills, as it does in the type of art education programs we examined, concern for the affective well-being of teachers is not only appropriate but may be necessary.

Further, involving teachers early on in practical, concrete training seems an effective way to promote the change in perspective and attitude associated with carrying out comprehensive, integrated art education programs. Organization theorists say "doing is believing" and that practical involvement with a new idea is a good way to generate allegiance to it. In-service training efforts such as those carried out in Project HEART and Hopkins illustrate the power of this adage.

---

[7]Thomas J. Peters and Robert H. Waterman, Jr., *In Search of Excellence*, Harper and Row, New York, 1982, pp. 318ff.

V. INSTITUTIONALIZATION

ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

Institutionalization is the last phase of the change process. The "special project" or protected status of an effort is over, initial development is complete, the staff is trained to carry out the program, and practices are ready to be incorporated into the district's ongoing routines. The problem of institutionalization is endemic to all programs, regardless of the source of their initiation and of their status as new or as a modification of traditional practice.

At the most general level, to say that a program or new curriculum has been "institutionalized" is to indicate that it has become part of the district's standard operating procedures and is reasonably secure in that status. However, this general definition masks several complex and difficult issues. Institutionalization means substantively different things at different levels of the school system.

Central office commitment to continue a program is clearly necessary. Without this support and the support of district officials, the technical, fiscal, and other resources necessary to sustain the program will not be forthcoming. Multiple resources are required to sustain an art education program—time, money, technical support, and space. However, central office support is not enough. Teachers also must be committed to continuing program practices in their classrooms. Unless they are, district decisions to continue a program can result in little more than pro forma teacher attention.

Conversely, teacher commitment by itself is insufficient to the institutionalization of new practices. Teacher enthusiasm for a new practice that is not matched by central office support can result in isolated and uneven continuation among district classrooms as needed resources are unavailable, staff turns over, and priorities of more explicit concern to district managers overtake teacher energy and attention.

A central "problem" of the institutionalization phase resembles issues central to the adoption phase: *mobilization of the necessary commitment and resources.* Just as the commitment of district administrators, board members, parents, and teachers was necessary to a strong project beginning, it is central to assured continuation. One problem, then, is how to secure this support.

Another crucial aspect of continuation resembles implementation concerns: *support for teacher growth and program development.* Continuing practice, like a developing practice, is an evolutionary phenomenon that takes place in a changing environment. To remain vital and effective, practices must change over time as teachers learn and grow and as the environment generates new demands. To see institutionalization as the installation of a "finished" program requiring no further development is to ensure eventual decay, *regardless of the level of success enjoyed at the end of the implementation phase.*

Besides questions about the level and amount of resources and commitment available to support institutionalization, two qualitative concerns arise during this phase. First, some provision must be made for the "socialization" of new entrants. Unless steps are taken to see that new staff acquire the skills and perspective necessary to competent execution of program activities, the quality of program practices will erode with the departure of the original staff cadre.

Second, the continuing developmental needs of the program must be addressed. The end of a program's developmental period does not mean that all issues have been "solved" forever. New learning needs are generated as teachers acquire new levels of skill and sophistication. Failure to address these needs can lead to stale classroom practices and gradual erosion in the quality of program activities.

Concomitantly, the curriculum must be reviewed and modified periodically both to accommodate new levels of teacher development and to correct the inevitable weaknesses in program protocol that surface over time. Institutionalization per se does not require attention to these issues of continued support for individual and curricular development. But if institutionalization concerns also encompass issues of the maintenance and development of program quality, then such concerns as these become central.

Our study sites represent a range of outcomes, falling along a continuum of "Fully institutionalized" to "Uncertain" (see Table 3).

Full Institutionalization

Full institutionalization as defined for this study means that the fiscal, technical, material, and other supports necessary for the continued operation of the art education program are available. It also means that strategies to support an even, high level of program quality across district classrooms are in place.

In Virginia Beach, the continued growth and stability of the art education program seems assured. Art education is viewed as having equal status with other curricular areas, and its major resource requirements have been met without debate. The district's written curriculum provides explicit direction and goals for art teachers new to Virginia Beach. Strong and clearly defined expectations have been created concerning adherence to the district's curriculum guide. Every fall, new teachers to the system receive orientation in using the guide and supporting materials. The curriculum is reviewed regularly to assess its quality, relevance, and degree of K-12 integration.

All these activities are supported by a central art supervisor who visits schools regularly to observe the quality of art instruction, notes the extent to which the curriculum is being followed, and identifies areas that need additional technical support and curriculum development. Together, these factors contribute to an art education program in Virginia Beach that is dynamic, secure, and implemented consistently across district classrooms.

Hopkins, too, appears to have a fully institutionalized art education program. As in Virginia Beach, art is solidly accepted throughout the system as an important part of the district curriculum. (In fact, in the district's curriculum guide, description of the art program takes up more room than does any other subject area.) A central office art specialist visits classrooms

Table 3

INSTITUTIONALIZATION OUTCOMES

Fully Institutionalized	Mixed	Uncertain
Hopkins	Milwaukee	Palo Alto
Virginia Beach	Whitehall	Project HEART
		Brooklyn #15

regularly, giving demonstration lessons, identifying technical assistance needs, and soliciting suggestions for the district's ongoing curriculum development effort.

Each elementary grade has a specific curriculum booklet that assists classroom teachers in providing a consistent level of services and forms the basis for training teachers new to the Hopkins art program. Most teachers follow the curriculum closely so that the elementary art specialist knows what lessons are being taught in the various grades during the different times of the year and can work to maintain consistency in the quality and nature of classroom activities throughout the district.

Continuing teachers receive substantial support for their development through a strong in-service education program. Hopkins teachers receive pay and release time for in-service activities. In addition to district-wide art education workshops, the elementary art specialist provides in-service education for teachers on a building basis.

Hopkins principals all received extensive in-service education in the district's art program and so are knowledgeable about goals and instructional strategies. Their commitment to a strong art education program is reinforced by clear signals from the superintendent's office that art is as important to the education of district youngsters as the so-called basics.

Support for the program seems secure. As the Hopkins superintendent put it when explaining their art program's process of development, "One of the basics is art. In developing district plans, the board didn't consider art as other than basic. Once those goals were in place and we started looking at where we were in relation to that, art was found wanting, so strengthening the art program was a matter of meeting a district goal." And the process of strengthening and building the Hopkins art education program continues. They are in the process of developing and testing a 7–12 curriculum. District staff are also designing an evaluation program to judge students' outcomes in art on both an objective and an intuitive basis. Hopkins strategies for institutionalization attend to both the material and qualitative needs of a strong, continuing art education program.

Mixed Institutionalization

Milwaukee and Whitehall have strong art education programs, yet their institutionalization status is mixed. Without question, district interest in art education is strong in Milwaukee and central office staff is exceptional. Art traditionally has enjoyed a high level of support in this community, and present district administrators have expressed commitment to art education. Further, the art program is well-established within the administrative structure of the district through the presence of an art coordinator and supervisory staff, curriculum guides, district workshops that include art, and inclusion of art in the television programs regularly offered to the schools. Perhaps the best evidence of the district's fundamental commitment to art is the continued support for the central art coordinator, a position that has been among the first of the fatalities in other fiscally pressed districts.

The institutionalization of art education activities is mixed in the unevenness of classroom practices, as described by the central office art supervisors. However, this aspect of ongoing operations may be strengthened. The superintendent has asked for evidence that the program is being implemented according to district plans.

In Whitehall, support for art education has remained constant and, indeed, is a tradition in much the same way as in Milwaukee. Through its originators' active dissemination efforts, the program was submitted for an award by the National Art Education Association; selection for this study has further strengthened the position of art and provided art with additional protection as district resources become tight. Both the external recognition and internal support

are due largely to the political savvy of the program's initiators. Not only do they take their show on the road as time permits, but they also apply meticulous attention to the continued visibility of art education in the district. School board members are briefed on program details, and the products of the program appear regularly in the community. Threatened program cuts quickly produce parent opposition.

It is at the level of "How well," that institutionalization is mixed in Whitehall. The program is in place but uneven in the four elementary schools, and it is fairly well-established at the junior high school.

In part, the variability in program activities seen in Whitehall is by design. The flexibility and teacher autonomy built into the program allow for substantial inter- and intraschool differences in the level of art instruction. Teacher autonomy allows them to teach as much or as little as their interest, ability, and confidence dictate. Without a central art coordinator, teachers govern their own information, education, and incorporation of the three domains. As Marjorie Wilson put it, "In Whitehall, when the pie is divided, the partition depends on the particular teacher."[1] The result is an uneven level of institutionalization among district classrooms.

Uncertain

Institutionalization in the remaining three sites—Brooklyn #15, Palo Alto, and Decatur/Champaign—must be judged uncertain at best. In Brooklyn #15, reliance on state teaching standards for art and the NYC curriculum guides, neither of which have comprehensive and wide-reaching goals, leads teachers to rely on their own implicit goals for art education.

Moreover, support for art education in Brooklyn #15 depends not on a central office decision (where there is strong support for art education), but on school-level decisions regarding allocation of their discretionary resources. Although most schools in the district have elected to fund a cultural arts position, whether these positions will be continued is uncertain. In short, there is no institutionalization of art education in Brooklyn #15. The absence of a central curriculum in the visual arts reflects strongly held values about school-level autonomy. Funds to support art positions in the schools are controlled at the school level. The former district arts supervisor was successful in marshaling support for a cultural arts position among most of the district's schools, but whether her successor (if, in fact, there *is* a successor) will be as successful is an open question.

Institutionalization of art education in the different district of Palo Alto also is uncertain in terms of both the level of financial support and the quality of classroom activities. Palo Alto is a community that actively supports the arts. Indeed, the school board's resolution requiring a fine arts credit for graduation was a response to these values. Despite this high level of community interest, art education does not, in our opinion, have a high standing in the priorities held for various subject areas within the curriculum. Had the district's art coordinator been less successful in obtaining outside funding from the state and from foundations to support SPECTRA, it is unclear what kind of financial commitment Palo Alto would have made once Proposition 13 budget cuts forced elimination of the elementary art specialists. Although district officials argue that retention of a central office position for an art coordinator and the seven period day demonstrates district commitment to an art program, the program is allocated barely adequate support.

[1]Personal communication.

The Palo Alto Unified School District, like other districts in California, is expected to provide students with fine arts education. However, given the priorities that drive allocation choices, particularly provision of strong instruction in the "basics," the level of support actually given art education is far less than one would conclude from the district's statement of educational philosophy.

Substantive institutionalization of the art program consistent with SPECTRA expectations also is uncertain. Generalist teacher learning appears uneven despite two to three years' participation in the program. Although these teachers had regular exposure to practicing artists delivering instruction in art history, criticism, and studio skills, there were few opportunities for actual "rehearsals"; and the extent to which generalist teachers paid attention to SPECTRA artist lessons depended on the teacher's level of interest. Principals' attitudes and knowledge will be critical if art education of the type supported by the SPECTRA program is to be provided consistently in the district's 4–6 classrooms.

Institutionalization does not exist at all at a formal level for the Project HEART program. But, as we shall see, this may be beneficial to its continued healthy existence in the Champaign/Decatur economic climate. Support for this effort remains where it began, largely ancillary to the formal structures of the Decatur and Champaign school systems. Decatur's industrial base is still in recession. Champaign officials discuss further school closings. The public blanches at suggestions of more curriculum costs. Teachers trained in Project HEART methods increasingly undertake project practices in their classrooms, but few district funds are allocated to support Project HEART activities. HEART keeps going on the director's donation of time, the regional education office's donation of space and some support services, and on a $19,000, Chapter 2 ECIA grant. In the spring of 1983, Project HEART and the Champaign School District both applied to the Illinois State Board of Education for additional Chapter 2 funds. The funding, which HEART received, is for the dissemination of Project HEART materials and information throughout the state. In addition, Project HEART is cooperating with the Illinois Arts Council through a $1500 grant to increase artist-in-residence activities in schools. Both continue to apply to foundations and other sources of private funding. However, even if all or only one of these applications were successful, the support provided would be short term. At the moment, it appears to us that Project HEART has few prospects for secure, long-term support.

Although Project HEART's ancillary status has forced project leaders to spend considerable time and energy on fund-raising, it also has protected its activities. Both the Decatur and the Champaign school systems have faced severe budget shortfalls. In both districts, expenditures not necessary to core district programs or required by state law have been curtailed or eliminated. In this climate, it is unlikely that the art coordinator would have received even the part-time support she enjoys now or that Project HEART activities could be continued in any systematic fashion. In a time of severe fiscal constraint, ancillary funding may be the only way to invigorate art education programs.

FACTORS AFFECTING INSTITUTIONALIZATION

The status of art education in the seven districts is the combined result of local adoption and implementation choices, district traditions, needs, staffing arrangements and resources, the character of individual schools and teachers, and the art education program itself. The outcomes described here are unique to each site, but several factors beyond absolute level of resources influenced the longer-term status of art education in all districts:

- A written curriculum,
- Principal commitment,
- Teacher training that supported learning,
- Strategies for program review and development.

A Written Curriculum

The experiences of our seven study sites do not weaken our belief that a written curriculum is important to the long-term continuation and development of an art education program. Indeed, to support the standards we brought to this study—a systematic, discipline-based art education program—a written curriculum appears vital. A written curriculum lends stability to practice over time. Without documents that incorporate the district's art education philosophy, goals, and strategy, art education activities are often contained disproportionately in the enthusiasm, expertise, and energy of single individuals. The Brooklyn #15 experience suggests how vulnerable practices built on such a base can be. Program implementation is hindered by the departure of the Cultural Arts Supervisor who was familiar with the lessons, strategies, and goals underlying the district's art education effort. Without these being recorded and integrated within a coherent framework, institutional memory necessary to guide future art education practices is lacking.

If there is no recorded agreement about the basic structure and content of art education in the district, teachers will develop practices that reflect their own interests, backgrounds, and levels of commitment to the visual arts. This may not be necessarily bad for individual classrooms, but the result over time will be highly variable practices operating under the rubric of a district-wide art education program.

The fear has been expressed that, where district officials take a written curriculum seriously, it stifles the creativity essential to high-quality visual art instruction. This study suggests that just the opposite is the case. A curriculum that specifies goals, broad objectives, and a range of strategies provides important *clarity* for teachers about expectations for classroom activities and the standards of good practice. Experience with planned educational change effects in a variety of curricular areas shows that development proceeds most confidently when these broad program goals are clear to participants.[2] Knowing the basic "rules of the game" frees teachers to emphasize development or innovative practice.

Finally, a written curriculum can testify to the status of art as a "real subject." The apparent amorphous quality of art education has long undermined the position of art education in the view of administrators. For example, more than 30 years ago Monro complained, "In contrast with the representatives of other subjects, especially the exact sciences, art teachers often seem to the administrator to be tiresomely incapable of making up their own minds as to what they want to teach and how, or even to the materials and equipment they need to teach it with."[3]

A written curriculum allows a similar genre of management oversight to be applied to art as is applied to other subjects. In both Hopkins and Virginia Beach, principals are charged with the evaluation of teacher performance in art education in just the same manner as they are responsible for assessing the quality of reading and mathematics instruction in their building. A written curriculum enables them to meet this responsibility. Principals in Virginia

[2]Paul Berman and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations*, The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, 1978.

[3]Cited by Clifford, 1979, p. 31.

Beach report, for example, that the district's art guide is sufficiently specified in broad goals, required lesson plans, and the like that they feel competent in evaluating the performance of their building art specialists. One commented,

> I can go through the art teacher's lesson plans and see whether the plans are made to support the sequential development of skills, and I can tell whether classroom activities support the concepts supposedly being presented to the students. I have to rely on [the district art coordinator] for a more sophisticated judgment about instructional quality, but by and large the district art curriculum guide gives me enough information to tell whether a teacher is providing art instruction at a level acceptable to the district.

The enhanced status afforded by a written curriculum can contribute greatly to the survival of art education, as budget cutters search for "frills" in the district's program.

Principal Commitment

Principal commitment to a strong art education program is a central and typically overlooked factor in planning for a strong art education program. Principals set the climate and expectations for instruction in their schools; teachers take cues for their own performance accordingly. Teacher choices about what to emphasize and notions about acceptable practice reflect those of their school principal. Given the traditionally marginal or ambiguous status of art education, principal signals concerning art are particularly important. Generalist teachers have multiple and competing demands on their time and attention. In the face of principal indifference, uneven and marginal teacher attention to art education would be expected. Here classroom art education activities would be more directly influenced by *teacher* preferences than by district-wide goals or procedures. Variation in principal interest in the visual arts and assumptions about the importance of art education, for example, contributes to the variation observed in Brooklyn #15's schools and among generalist teachers participating in Palo Alto's SPECTRA program. Conversely, the express involvement of principals in the art program has had clear benefit in Hopkins and in Virginia Beach. In both districts the seriousness with which principals take their evaluation responsibilities has communicated to the teachers that art is to be accorded status equal to other subject areas.

The commitment of school principals is especially critical in districts that are highly decentralized, such as Brooklyn #15. Acknowledging the principal's pivotal position, Brooklyn #15's superintendent attempts to appoint principals that share his philosophy for a substantively strong, sequential art education program as vacancies occur. However, replacement through attrition is a slow means of building the support necessary for an art program, especially in established urban districts such as Brooklyn where enrollment has been steadily declining.

Teacher Training that Supports Learning

It is one thing to carry out program activities under the watchful eye of a program coordinator and the support of special in-service education activities conducted during the implementation stage of a new program. It is quite another to provide a consistently high quality of instruction in a new area after these supports have been reduced or withdrawn.

During the implementation phase, teachers can be "successful" by closely following the instructions provided in workshops or special classes and relying on readily available assistance when uncertainty arises. It is possible for teachers to carry out a new practice during the implementation phase of a program's development without actually having *learned* the central program concepts or skills.

Continuation of program practices over time requires that teachers acquire the *conceptual* understanding necessary for them to successfully adapt program strategies to the diverse situations that practitioners confront.[4] In-service education that provides blueprints for practice, however comprehensive and sophisticated, cannot support this fundamental sort of teacher learning. It is useless merely to provide teachers with information and specific training in the practices associated with particular models without also increasing their ability to translate the information and skill into new practices as situations and their own level of development changes. Thorough understanding of a program's *conceptual* base is necessary for teachers to use new skills and concepts to effectively accommodate diverse student needs and changing factors in the complex school environment.

Teacher learning of this kind is also necessary if teachers are to develop their skills and knowledge beyond what they acquired during implementation. Continuing teacher development or maturation requires a firm grasp of program concepts and the conceptual framework in which practices are based.

Our project sites, together with other experience in planned educational change, suggest the need for a training model that explicitly recognizes the stages of teacher development. These stages can be roughly categorized as survival, consolidation, and mastery (Nemser, 1982, p. 161).

Much in-service education provided during implementation ignores the first two stages of teacher development to focus directly on mastery (Lieberman and Miller, 1979). Training typically concentrates exclusively on providing the skills and knowledge associated with competent practice. However, experience shows that training that does not attend to the "survival" and "consolidation" stages of development leads to short-term and ephemeral "learning" (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Fuller and Brown, 1975). Teacher competence apparent at the end of the implementation stage disappears over time in part *because teachers never really learned the new practices in the first place.*

The survival stage signals teacher uncertainty about why the learning of new practices is important and how to function at a minimal level of competence. The basic needs of the survival stage as seen by one authority are:

- Effective persuasion that the new classroom practices will make them better teachers,
- Systematic and continuing feedback about the development of new roles and skills,
- Time for reflection and interaction with other teachers engaged in the same learning activities,
- The availability of a "mentor" to support teacher efforts to grow and change (Fuller and Brown, 1975).

The consolidation stage denotes teacher efforts to bring together disparate aspects of project training and to integrate new practices and perspectives into traditional roles and routines. The requirements fundamental to this second stage of teacher development are said to be:

- "Safe" rehearsal opportunities,
- Thorough understanding of the practices' conceptual base,
- Clarity about goals, expectations, and teacher role,
- Administrator support and interest.

Project HEART and Hopkins provide good examples of a training model that addresses the

[4]See Mitchell and Kerchner, 1982.

needs associated with each developmental stage. Both began training with explicit efforts to demonstrate the pedagogical power of the new program. Once teacher professional incentives were engaged, the training turned to demonstration and practice of activities that incorporated program concepts. Teachers received abundant feedback about their efforts during in-service sessions and after classroom lessons. At the same time, teachers acquired confidence in their skills, and in-service sessions emphasized the philosophical underpinnings of the new practices, assisting teachers in understanding the conceptual rationale for their new knowledge and role.

Lack of attention to these training issues contributes to the uneven or uncertain institutionalization in our other study sites. For example, minimal concrete rehearsal time means that many Palo Alto teachers do not feel as secure as they might in taking over SPECTRA activities. In Whitehall, a large portion of the variation in teacher activities within and across the three domains, in our opinion, can be attributed to the failure of many teachers to acquire substantial understanding of the theoretical principles underlying the practices they adopted. More than technical understanding and competence is required to bring consistency "behind the classroom door."

Strategies for Program Review and Development

Institutionalization does not signal the end of program development and change. Instructional vitality and relevance require the regular review of program goals and strategies. The absence of such review invites stagnation and lack of interest. Program relevance will erode over time as students change and the field develops, and teachers' needs and interests change.

Such strategies as the review procedures in Virginia Beach are effective in supporting the continued vigor of the art education program. Concomitantly, the oversight provided by the central coordinator tracks teacher developmental needs and allows for the targeting of specific technical assistance and art education in-service education that reflects teacher needs.

The art curriculum is reviewed regularly as part of standard district operating procedures. Virginia Beach has systematized the process of curriculum review and development through the creation of standing committees in each of the major subject areas. These committees—composed of supervisors, parents, teachers, counselor, and students—meet at least five days each year to examine the extent to which the K-12 curriculum is unified. The art curriculum and development committee also receives suggestions about the quality of the instructional program and develops recommendations for needed change. This strategy ensures both the ongoing review of the art curriculum and the input from clients, deliverers, administrators, and consumers. Thus the curriculum and supporting activities are reviewed from the perspective of the quality of instructional activities as well as the developmental level of teachers.

Conclusions

Plans must be made early on for incorporating art education into district routines of program review and staff development; its long-term stability depends to a substantial extent upon its participation in these regular district functions. Art educators often claim that they and their activities are "different" in form and function from other subject areas and that district procedures applied elsewhere are irrelevant to art. However, the sites examined in this study underscore the importance of incorporating art education activities into mainline district activities—evaluation, curriculum review, instructional guides, and in-service education. The anti-institutional attitude assumed by many art educators contains the seeds of their

programmatic demise. In contrast, this study suggests that art educators should work for equal treatment rather than continuing to claim exemption because of the special features of art education. Art educators' fear that standardization in terms of district routines will generate wooden and unimaginative visual arts programs is not warranted, according to our study sites. One of the programs that had the greatest requirements for standardized practice—Virginia Beach—was also a site that showed exciting classroom practices and student outcomes in the opinion of the art education expert who studied the program.

Our study sites offer positive examples of teacher training models and district structural arrangements that can support a strong, vital art education effort. The toughest problem facing art education advocates is that of district level support for strong visual arts programs. As Palo Alto shows, even strong community interest in the arts does not ensure art education a high priority in the district's instructional agenda. Milwaukee illustrates how even express district commitment to a substantial art education program can be affected by competing demands on limited district resources. The largely discretionary status of art education makes it exceedingly vulnerable in times of tight resources. However, Milwaukee also illustrates the benefits of strong commitment and structural integration in a period of retrenchment. Although Milwaukee's art education program is not as "fat" as it was in more comfortable fiscal times, the district still manages to provide a much more comprehensive range of instructional activities in the visual arts than can be found in most of the nation's school districts. Art education in Milwaukee has the organizational structures and instructional supports (a central office coordinator, instructional materials, and so on) to survive through tight times.

Institutionalization is a complex process that raises problems central to the adoption and implementation phases: mobilization of commitment to art education and support for the continued growth of teachers, as well as program materials. The issues particular to this last phase of the change process do not begin when special implementation activities end. Instead, questions on institutionalization must be addressed when initial program activities occur, especially district administrator and board support for a strong art education program. As long as the status of art education relative to other "core" subjects is in question, this involves persistent lobbying efforts before school managers and active participation in the local education political arena.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The programs we examined are among the pioneers in developing and carrying out art education programs that incorporate the three domains of history, criticism, and production. They are also unusual in the status accorded art education. This approach to art education can be seen in individual schools and classrooms around the country, but there are few *districts* where art is treated as much more than a frill or where serious efforts are made to establish an art curriculum that includes all three domains. In a time of tight fiscal resources and uncertain support for art education, the absolute accomplishments of our sites cannot be underestimated. Against the standards brought to this study, however, some district efforts were better developed, more stable, or more firmly established than others. Most had yet to achieve a balance among art criticism, history, and production, and important issues of long-term stability have yet to be resolved, which indicates how difficult it will be to change the way art is taught elsewhere, even where districts value comprehensive, discipline-based art education as an objective.

Changing the way art is taught begs for a radical shift in perspective. As our study substantiates, art is generally not recognized as a cognitive subject with the same importance for a child's development as other basic disciplines. Policymakers, administrators, teachers, and consumers have traditionally regarded art classes as entertainment or therapy. This perspective has been reinforced by classroom practice, which almost universally emphasizes production—often of the arts-and-crafts variety. This practice is the logical extension of most teacher training in art education.

In studying the programs at our seven sites, we tried to answer two major questions. First, what are the factors that generate support for a strong, substantive art education program in a district's curriculum? Second, what factors influence the willingness and ability of school districts and teachers to carry out and maintain a discipline-based art education that strives for balance among the historical, critical, and productive domains of the visual arts?

Part of the answer to both questions lay in the nature of the program effort undertaken. We saw that discipline-based, fairly well-specified programs appealed to education practitioners and policymakers because of their strong substantive orientation. But we also saw that programs of this genre had implications for implementation. The district practices we examined provide rich descriptions of the different ways in which art education can be approached. Our case studies also show how factors particular to a school district—resources, political climate, staff expertise, educational philosophy, for example—profoundly shape art education practices and generate differences in program scope, goals, and methods. Nonetheless, our research also suggests that viable, academically "respectable" programs in any setting will have three broad characteristics: an articulated conceptual base, a written curriculum, and one that is sequential.

AN ARTICULATED CONCEPTUAL BASE

Where a district's program has no articulated theoretical base, it is difficult to view art as a discipline. Unless a district adopts and articulates a coherent theoretical approach to art education, it is hard to achieve consistency across classrooms, much less compatible practice in

the three domains. Teachers will simply follow their often uninformed "druthers." Moreover, given most classroom teachers' lack of any systematic art training, they are more likely to follow the arts-and-crafts approach.[1] Each of our study sites did subscribe to a perspective that valued instruction in the three domains. However, theory associated with the discipline of art history, criticism, and production affected instruction more or less, depending on how it was articulated.

A WRITTEN CURRICULUM

Theory is not enough to change or galvanize classroom practice. Our sites underscore the importance of embodying theoretical concepts in a written curriculum that provides examples to guide classroom activities. It is not enough to provide a statement of theory and encourage teachers to tailor their favorite art lessons to this theory. When teachers try to graft newly acquired concepts of history and criticism to familiar routines, uncertainty arises and the studio activities continue to predominate. Nor is it always sufficient to let teachers develop their own lessons around concepts stated so broadly that they support various approaches. Although such an approach can foster innovation in art education curriculum, ironically it also can constrain invention because teachers have insufficient clarity and confidence to explore new ideas. A clear lesson of this study is that specificity can foster creativity. A written curriculum that describes goals for practice and program objectives provides the structure necessary to the confident pursuit of new ideas and strategies. A written curriculum also is more amenable to evaluation, an important activity for both curricular accountability and program development. Unless clarity exists about objectives and strategies, it is difficult to assess the extent to which they have been achieved or identify areas for improvement.

A SEQUENTIAL CURRICULUM

In the other basic subjects, like reading and mathematics, continuity is a key attribute of the effective curriculum. Each grade assumes and builds on what the student learns in earlier grades or domains. If art is to be treated as an academic subject, an art program should evidence this kind of continuity. Just as a written curriculum is necessary to link theory and classroom practice and to promote balance among the three domains, it is also an effective means of ensuring continuity.

FACTORS THAT SUPPORT ART EDUCATION

A district may articulate theoretical concepts and embody them in a sequential, written curriculum, yet still fail to establish an art program that balances instruction among the three domains, that has internal consistency, or that maintains high quality. Programs will lack these attributes unless district policies and practices support curricular objectives.

Changing the national character of art education will be an enormous undertaking. Previous research has shown that any kind of institutional change is difficult to design, inititate, and implement.[2] It is even more difficult to require that people accept new concepts, develop new attitudes, and acquire fundamentally new skills. Because influential people at all our sites

[1]See Goodlad, 1984, pp. 218–219.

[2]See Fullan, 1982; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978.

advocated change to a more comprehensive art education program, we have learned a lot from analyzing the differences in local practices and the critical factors associated with program establishment at all sites.

There is no one "right" way to initiate, implement, or sustain a comprehensive art education program. Those who want changes must consider not only their programmatic objectives but also the institutional setting. However, some factors were crucial at all stages of planning and carrying out an art education program.

- Active support from administrators, teachers, parents, and students;
- Financial and other resources, such as time, space, and expert consulting help;
- The active involvement of an art specialist.

Art education has suffered from neglect, not resistance. Consequently, the most important factor is the commitment to change that translates into resources and into active support from all levels of the system. Our district-based programs second the literature's contention that support should be backed by local education policy and must reflect wide agreement that the program has educational worth and is needed. Unless district board members and administrators believe that the program will contribute to the district's overall goals and is critical to a balanced instructional program, they will not allocate scarce resources to it nor give it very high priority. However, this support will not make a new art program secure unless teachers and principals understand and endorse the program's merit and methods. Where school-level support is missing, pro forma implementation is the probable result. Nothing will really change in the classroom. The views of teachers who are not directly involved with the art program convey important messages to students, parents, and others about the educational stake of art. Teachers can be a potent force in perpetuating an "art-as-recreation" assessment of the role of art education. In our study sites many (if not all) teachers held art in esteem as an important instructional area. Finally, if the community does not support the program, school board members and administrators are unlikely to keep it afloat with budget dollars.

This broad-based support must also generate resources other than dollars. They include the expert help needed to develop programs that incorporate the three domains, time in school and district schedules for a substantive art education program, physical space for both productive and responsive activities, and facilities and human resources for training teachers and supporting their efforts.

The various study programs reflect different levels of district support and resource commitment. District administrators at some sites actively participated with program staff to find and allocate resources at all stages of change. At other sites, district interests and constraints limited district personnel to moral support, and program staff had to marshal resources. This was especially true for districts that faced severe fiscal limitations.

The active involvement of an art specialist also made a central contribution to effective program outcomes. The crucial art specialist role was not direct instruction, although students clearly benefited where districts were able to provide specialists for the classroom. The key specialist role was that of coordinator and facilitator, complementing and supporting the activities of both generalist and specialist teachers responsible for art instruction. Art specialists serving this function brought a special and invaluable vitality, consistency, challenge and rigor to the program, regardless of whether it was generalist or specialist based. A coordinator undoubtedly would enhance any art education activity. But in programs attempting to carry out discipline-based programs that attended to the three domains, this specialist role seemed vital. Few individual teachers had the perspective, the time, or the expertise to identify

opportunities for integration, new materials, or strategies, nor could they learn from colleagues' practices. Art specialists serving as coordinators and facilitators were uniquely able to address these important tasks.

Critical Factors for Initiation

At the initiation stage, we found three other critical elements: (1) presence of a skilled political advocate, (2) outside resources, and (3) strategies for involving teachers and principals.

The Arts Advocate. Because art education is a "non-issue" in most school districts, strong, three-domain programs will not materialize without the presence of an articulate, politically skilled arts advocate. Only such a person can make the district and the community recognize the need for substantive art education and mobilize the resources for getting it underway. Where there is no support for art education, this advocacy must be more than substantive—it must be expressly political. Political skills are among the most crucial and neglected components of fundamental reform in art education. Without them, advocates cannot generate the support and build the coalitions to press for change.

In our study, it did not matter where these advocates came from, but their presence was the catalytic factor. In only two districts did advocacy originate with central office staff. Elsewhere, this necessary and effective "push" came from various quarters. In one district the arts advocates came from the teaching staff; in two others, the central office art specialists were the prime movers; in another, a community activist built the coalition that designed, implemented, and disseminated the program.

Outside Resources. Even when an arts advocate can elicit or reinforce district and community support, outside resources often prove crucial to initiate an arts program. Federal funds figured strongly at three of our sites; private foundations and the state department of education funds were crucial at another. Resources besides funds also proved important. Staff responsible for curriculum development in several sites discovered that existing models were not appropriate and that they did not have the theoretical background to develop a conceptual framework. University-based art educators provided critical advice and assistance. State department of education specialists were central in one site.

Strategies To Involve Teachers and Principals. Successful implementation of new programs depends heavily on involving teachers and principals early on in project planning.[3] Teachers and principals are the key actors in any education program; their support and commitment ultimately determine how effective a program will be. In our study, art programs that enjoyed the strongest teacher and principal commitment were also those in which the districts had made the greatest efforts to involve teachers and principals during initiation. This involvement took various forms, but by the time programs reached the implementation phase, teachers and principals had strong commitment to the programs and to maintaining a strong art education effort.

Critical Factors for Implementation

In addition to support and resource commitment, we found that three factors were critical in carrying out art programs: (1) concrete, ongoing training; (2) well-specified instructional goals; and (3) central coordination. Inevitably, the weaknesses and strengths of the initial

[3]See Fullan, 1982.

planning or initiation phase carry over and provide a shaky or solid base for implementation activities. But once a program is underway, these additional and somewhat different factors become important. Concrete, ongoing training ideally builds on teacher involvement during initiation. Well-specified instructional goals reflect the quality of advocacy and the level of expertise that shaped the adoption phase. And active central coordination implies the degree of district support and commitment to the program.

Concrete, Ongoing Training. Implementing a three-domain art program presents a very high-order learning task for teachers. First, the methodology of art education is underdeveloped compared with that of, say, mathematics. Second, there is even less guidance for programs that incorporate criticism and history. Third, in addition to new content and methods, teachers have to shift their perspective on art education.[4] Much of the learning they need to implement the new program should take place during the initiation phase. However, there is so much for teachers to absorb that training cannot be treated as if it were a one shot inoculation. A program this demanding requires training that allows teachers to learn in increments geared to the level of conceptual sophistication and to actual classroom practice.

The outcomes at our sites underlined how important this kind of training is. We judged the "outcome" of implementation by (1) how confident teachers were that they could carry out the program, (2) how well they actually did, (3) the consistency of classroom activities with program goals, and (4) the consistency and quality of classroom practices across participating schools.

Outcomes across sites varied widely and correlated closely with training practices. For example, where teachers were given many opportunities to practice activities and skills in a workshop environment, many achieved a remarkable level of skill in a new conceptual approach and methods of art instruction, and their classroom practices were consistent with program goals. "Rehearsals" were an effective strategy at sites where teachers were urged to try out new skills immediately in their classrooms, and project resource staff visited frequently to give them support and feedback on their efforts.

Another district accomplished this by extensively training a group of pilot teachers in each unit of the curriculum and having the elementary art specialist visit each classroom regularly to observe, demonstrate, and assist, as needed. These teachers thus received a tailored, practical training that allowed them to provide ongoing assistance to other elementary teachers.

Well-specified Instructional Framework and Goals. A clearly defined conceptual framework offers an art program the appearance of academic seriousness. This framework must include specific instructional goals. Teachers find these elements critically important because implementation is a two-step process that involves learning the rules and then learning to do better. In the case of art education, where there is no "best practice," the rules of the game become even more important. Especially for generalist teachers, clearly specified frameworks and goals provide a reassuring base of operation.

Implementation outcomes related directly to the level of specificity. Where the curriculum specified the goals and conceptual parameters in detail, this characteristic contributed to the program quality and consistency. This result cannot be dismissed as a *post hoc* fallacy: Teachers who were interviewed overwhelmingly cited the curriculum guide as a major source of their confidence in teaching and in maintaining high quality.

---

[4]That last reason explains why specialist as well as generalist teachers need concrete, ongoing training. Unlike most generalists, specialists are completely at home with production activities, but they need to come to accept and practice the historical and critical elements of art education.

Active Central Coordination. Even with ongoing training and clearly specified guidelines, implementation has more chance of success if districts provide active central coordination. Through regular classroom visits, a central coordinator can continually evaluate the program's developmental needs, monitor program consistency across classrooms, target technical assistance resources, and support teacher efforts. In programs that address the three domains, the coordinator also plays a crucial role in maintaining quality by identifying resources for the program. Few generalist teachers have the expertise or time to locate and prepare the varied materials required for a strong arts program. Even the specialist teachers, who could be expected to have perfect confidence in choosing materials, commented that without someone to bring new materials to their attention, they would tend to rely on a relatively static pool of resources. That tendency would vitiate program activities.

Critical Factors in Maintaining an Art Program

If a program has sufficient resources and support from district administrators and has survived the implementation phase, it will probably be maintained—at least in form. However, formal institutionalization does not guarantee that a program will actually continue to realize its potential or its goals. By our definition, a program is not fully institutionalized unless it has the fiscal, technical, material, and other resources necessary to support its continued operation and unless the strategies to ensure a high and even level of program quality are in place. The prospects for stable maintenance varied considerably among our sites, ranging from assured to uncertain to unlikely. These different outcomes reflected how important the following four elements are for institutionalization: (1) a written curriculum, (2) school principal commitment, (3) teacher training that supports learning, and (4) strategies for program review and development.

A Written Curriculum. A written curriculum ideally embodies the program's theoretical base; it ensures stability and consistency of practices over time; and it actually encourages creativity, rather than stifling it, by making teachers secure about the program's conceptual parameters and confident in continuing program development efforts. Perhaps most important for this study's basic concern, a written curriculum gives art the same academic "respectability" that the other basic subjects have and makes it subject to the same kinds of accountability standards. The sites that had the most successful programs also had the most specific, comprehensive, and prescriptive curricula.

Commitment of School Principals. Districts planning a strong arts program would do well to secure their principals' commitment to that program. Other planned change studies have documented the importance of that commitment to any "change-agent" effort. Our study reveals that it is very important for arts programs. Teachers generally take their cue from principals about the importance of subjects and activities and about the expectations for instruction. For art, the principal's signals are especially critical. Given the demands that generalist teachers face, they will quite rationally use the principal's priorities to allocate their own time and attention.

If principals express no explicit commitment to a district program, art education activities will reflect teacher preferences. However, if principals express preferences at odds with a district program, that program may not be fully institutionalized in their schools. At our sites, variation in principals' interest and assumptions about art education contributed to the variation observed in the long-term prospects for art education.

Teacher Training that Supports Learning. To remain vital, education programs should provide for teacher training needs that are generated by a changing environment. It is not enough to give teachers survival skills. Districts should ensure ongoing and more comprehensive training for teachers in the program and take steps to see that new staff acquire the skills and perspective that a three-domain program requires.

During implementation, teachers usually receive considerable feedback about their instruction and support to carry on—even if they haven't actually learned the central concepts and skills. However, after institutionalization, much of this support is withdrawn, and teachers may find it difficult to continue program activities, much less make them consistently effective. Consequently, districts need to provide for continuing in-service education that allows time for teachers to work through the survival, consolidation, and mastery stages.

Among our sites, there are good examples of training programs that addressed each developmental stage. They typically began during the initiation phase, by demonstrating the pedagogical power of the new program to motivate the teachers. This was followed with demonstration and practice of activities that embodied program concepts, and they provided feedback about teacher efforts during the implementation phase. After the end of that phase, the districts continued with in-service sessions that focused explicitly on the conceptual rationale of the teachers' new knowledge and roles. They have thus prepared the teachers to identify new material and develop new activities on their own that will still accord with program objectives. At sites where we observed variation within and across the three domains, much of that variation resulted because teachers had not fully grasped the theoretical principles underlying program practices.

Strategies for Program Review and Development. Programs that are not reviewed and not continually developing will stagnate and eventually bore both teachers and students. Program relevance will erode over time as students change and as teachers' interests and competence develop. Once programs are institutionalized, districts should not assume that they are immutable and self-sustaining. To guarantee that they will retain their vitality, reviews should go beyond monitoring the quality of classroom practices. They should also continue to address the relevance of underlying concepts and of the curriculum's substance, especially where certain activities and materials are prescribed.

One district has institutionalized a review procedure that should ensure the vitality of its art program. It has created standing committees for each of the major subject areas, including art. These committees are composed of supervisors, parents, teachers, counselors, and students. The art committee meets several times a year to examine how unified the curriculum is and to receive suggestions and recommendations for change. This strategy guarantees not only that the curriculum is reviewed but also that it will continue to be shaped by the concerns and needs of people at all system levels. All of the programs we examined were evolving and changing to reflect changed conditions, professional growth, and new interests. Routine review and revision procedures contribute substantially to this programmatic vitality.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The conception of art education embraced by the Getty Center is a viable one. Major problems in achieving this vision will be changing public perceptions about the arts and learning more about how to provide sequential, discipline-based art education that addresses criticism, history, and production. The Center's conceptualization of visual arts education as a challenging academic subject is compatible with the view that teachers, school board members,

practitioners, and the public hold about the fundamental purpose of schooling and the importance of rigor. This compatibility is a major asset to the Trust and to other advocates of a cognitive approach to visual arts education. Yet the extent to which discipline-based, sequential arts education makes its way into the schools and the extent to which the visual arts achieve the status accorded traditional "academic" subjects are problematic. They depend on complex and interrelated factors that touch all parts and levels of the nation's education system and involve diverse agencies and actors: *support* for art education; *educational programs* to provide instruction; *professional development* to support instruction and training; *a knowledge base* to inform training, program development, and practice.

Support for Art Education

The support necessary to the development, implementation, and institutionalization of a strong, discipline-based art education program is patently political. In the course of this study it became clear that traditional art education networks thus far have not been effective in mobilizing the support necessary to change the priorities for arts education or create demand for a strong art education program of any type. Members of the professional arts and art education networks communicate primarily with each other, not with those whose support is necessary to change the status and fortune of art. Effective support for the arts must extend beyond the arts community or art education networks into the broader social and political system. Consequently, change in the nature and level of support for art education requires *multiple* legitimate voices calling for strong art education. As a first step, however, it is crucial to strengthen and activate the existing art education networks and to identify particularly effective arts advocates. But then it will be important to develop issue networks outside of the field to support art education by engendering interest and enthusiasm among groups as diverse as state legislators, parent and community groups, and educators not directly involved in the arts. The support of these non-art educators is essential to restructuring the education policy systems to afford legitimacy to the arts, to creating demand for discipline-based art education, and to nurturing its development.

Realization of the Getty Center's goals assumes broad-based support for change in two important policy areas. First, support must be mobilized within the policy system to change the structures and priorities that affect the activities of school systems and relegate arts education to an inferior position in the curriculum and in the educationa' policy structure. Numerous "gatekeeping" functions within the education policy system function to establish priorities, direct assignment of resources, and generate demand. Among the most important are high school graduation and college entrance requirements, the content and objectives of standardized assessment measures, and the course work specified by generalist and specialist credentials. These structural features of the education policy system signal the relative importance of an activity, focus attention on an area of study, and effectively create space for an instructional area in the curriculum. College entrance requirements, for example, largely determine the high school course of study for academically talented students because they detail necessary course work, and they assign implicit status to instructional areas. The requirements specified by most elite post-secondary institutions and by many state college and university systems depress interest in the arts among college-bound students, not only because fine arts is not required for college entrance but also because art courses do not even "count" in determining entering credits. It is not surprising, then, that college aspirants, their parents, and their counselors afford low priority to the arts. Similarly, neglect in the standardized tests

that measure student progress at elementary and secondary levels minimizes the arts' position in the curriculum. Teacher credential requirements that slight the arts as necessary to elementary level certification communicate ancillary status for the arts.

Second, support must be mobilized to change the leading ideas that motivate art education and shape classroom practice. Although many university-based art educators champion the Getty's conception of visual arts education, generally it is neither well-known nor well-understood. Production activities dominate classroom instruction and teacher training, not because discipline-based art education in the three domains has been rejected, but because studio activities are thought to define the field. Trainers of teachers, curriculum planners, art specialists, elementary level generalists responsible for arts education, as well as education policymakers need to be exposed to this discipline-based conception of art education, and their support for it must be engendered. Similarly, the support of parents and other influentials must be marshaled to express demand for this vision of art education. As any economist or politican knows, demand drives supply.

Education Programs

The ability of practitioners to carry out art education programs consistent with the Getty's conception, and indeed their willingness to consider change in their current art education practice, turns on the availability of programs to serve as models. Generation of support for a strong art education program will depend in large part on the ability of advocates to *show* what can be accomplished in visual arts education and what programs compatible with the Getty's vision would actually look like. However, there is no "one best model" of visual arts education. Art educators in our study sites developed diverse approaches to discipline-based art education and to incorporating history, criticism, aesthetics, and studio activities in a program of visual arts instruction. But concrete, well-specified models of practice are necessary to change in current practice.

Models clearly are important as guides to practice and as a source of suggestion about structural approaches to instruction and various pedagogical strategies. The existence of a well-developed model can show teachers, administrators, and policymakers how various techniques can work together, demonstrate the resources required, and provide concrete examples for training. Not all districts have the interest or capacity to engage in the developmental efforts seen in several of our study sites; their receptivity to changed practice will hinge in large measure on the availability of a coherent, specified visual arts program.

Teachers are fundamentally and appropriately conservative in considering new or modified instructional practices. What often has been billed as "teacher resistance to change" actually reflects teachers' professionally based concerns about the effect of a new practice on their students. Even where their students' performances are disappointing, teachers generally are not willing to make a change unless they are confident that their students will do no worse or predictably better as a result of changed practice. Well-developed models of practice give teachers this confidence and motivation to change.

Given the substantive differences among school districts, it will be important that the models of practice and examples of learning materials and plans encompass activities suitable to various settings and to broad variation in resource base, expertise, and educational philosophy. Promising approaches to this end of programmatic diversity include support and development of existing promising, locally developed curricula, materials, and plans, as well as development efforts focused on a few especially receptive school districts. These field-based

practices then could form the nucleus of a dissemination/demonstration network to support implementation on a broader scale.

Professional Development

Developing the capacity to plan, implement, and support discipline-based, sequential art education programs requires attention to professional development at all levels of the education policy system. At the university level, art education professors and faculty responsible for teacher training require exposure to the theories, principles, and practices consistent with this view of art education and assistance in providing relevant training to teachers, administrators, and other educators. The importance attached to visual arts education, as well as the leading ideas that will shape visual arts curriculum in the main are formed as individuals move through post-secondary institutions. Development activities for university personnel thus are key to modifying the cycle in which "teachers teach as they were taught"[5] and to changing notions of appropriate practice.

Unless concepts of art education practice and the status of the arts in the curriculum are modified at the post-secondary level, there is little reason to expect that the view advocated by the Getty Center and others will make its way into the public schools to any extent. The system simply will perpetuate itself. Furthermore, as we have seen in this study, university personnel are an invaluable resource for local practitioners as they begin their own planning and development efforts. University faculty can play several important roles in fostering discipline-based art education. They may serve as theoretician, bringing conceptual consistency to local plans; they may provide a necessary bridge between theory and practice, interpreting abstract principles, suggesting important developmental considerations in planning curriculum sequence, and expanding the conceptual vision of local educators. Especially in the areas of history, criticism, and aesthetics, there is little hope for obtaining practical application of general principles without collaboration between academics and practitioners. University-based personnel, then, are central to implementing this conception of art at many junctures—pre-service training, in-service education, and special project workshop efforts.

Teachers, both generalists and specialists, clearly require professional education in the concept of art education advocated here and in the skills and concepts necessary to carry it out. Unless teachers are well-trained in the program approaches and have confident understanding of the necessary techniques and philosophical base, classroom practices are unlikely to change consistently, or in the direction of a discipline-based visual arts curriculum. However, educators other than those directly responsible for providing art education also need professional development activities to foster an appreciation of a strong visual arts curriculum and the legitimacy of art education in an instructional program. The views of principals and central office staff about the worth and the nature of art education are pivotal in shaping teacher receptivity to changed art education practice and in establishing the esteem accorded the arts in the district. For an activity as traditionally peripheral as the arts, it is crucial that actors central to the educational enterprise value art education and confer legitimacy and status upon it as an academic subject. Fostering these views among educators only indirectly involved in art education thus constitutes an important professional development issue.

---

[5]L. Cuban, *How Teachers Taught: Consistency and Change in American Classrooms, 1890–1980*, Longman, New York, 1984.

Knowledge Base

Enhanced support for art education, the development of educational programs to guide practice, and professional development for educators at all levels of the system depend fundamentally on the existence of a knowledge base. The knowledge base necessary to a strong, academic art education effort incorporates issues that range from practical and immediate concerns to long-range theoretical questions. Some immediate knowledge needs are primarily statistical. They include such questions as the number of art educators practicing in the nation's schools, enrollment figures at the secondary level, the frequency and nature of art education in the nation's elementary schools, the number of post-secondary institutions offering training in the visual arts and the courses available to future art educators and generalist teachers, and an inventory of high school graduation requirements and college entrance requirements across the country. Without this information about the condition of art education in America, advocates will be hampered in developing realistic proposals for changes in education codes and testing requirements, and in outlining the need for increased attention to the arts. This census-like information is necessary to sketch the policy problems facing art educators and to develop strategies to mobilize support.

Theoretical knowledge is essential to support development of practice and an agenda for continuing research and scholarship. For example, there is insufficient information about the contribution of visual arts education to the development of perceptual skills and the contribution of these skills to overall intellectual capacity and to other academic areas.

Evaluation, which embodies obvious practical issues, is another area that raises fundamental and insufficiently examined theoretical concerns. What are the multiple outcomes associated with visual arts education? What is the relationship among them? How can they be measured? What would constitute standards of "success" in an art education effort of the type examined in this study? Resolution of these evaluation issues is essential to the vitality and secure existence of art education. Policymakers and others legitimately ask of art educators, "Where do we want to go and how do we know when we've gotten there?" Thus far, there are few satisfying answers to these questions. Yet exhortation or assertion alone is insufficient to support either policies consistent with a strong art education effort or significant program development efforts.

Research and development activities of another stripe also make up the knowledge base essential to a strong art education tradition. Why is it so difficult, for example, to develop and carry out discipline-based art education programs at the secondary level? What are productive and realistic ways to connect elementary and secondary instruction in the visual arts? Is a K-12 curriculum feasible? The problems encountered in generating support and commitment at the elementary level for a discipline-based, sequential art education program escalate dramatically at the secondary level. If the objectives represented by the Center's position on art education are to be realized, identification and assessment of compatible secondary level and K-12 programs is a research task of highest priority.

Another important component of the knowledge base is experience with the multiple and diverse roles art specialists can play. Specialists have been trained to provide instruction, and this is the role they typically assume. However, art specialists have become a scarce resource in education; most school districts have no art education specialists to support art education. An important task for development is the identification of ways in which art specialists can multiply the effects of their skills and expertise by assuming new roles or revising traditional ones. The facilitating, coordinating roles seen in this study are examples of how art specialists can reach more students and have a greater influence on practice by working through

generalist teachers. Another role could involve specialists housed at regional or state levels, responsible for specialist assistance to assigned school districts, rather than for the direct delivery of art education instruction. Art specialists have become even more critical to the health and quality of art education as fiscal retrenchment forces cutbacks in their number and in arts instruction. They are essential to realization of the goals of a discipline-based, sequenced art program. But in most areas of the country, the effectiveness of their contribution will depend on the extent to which they have revised their traditional role to complement and supplement the efforts of generalist teachers.

The ability of educators, policymakers, professors, advocates, and others to stimulate commitment to a strong art education program, to promote classroom implementation, and to provide appropriate professional development depends, finally, on a strong, vital knowledge base; but it is also true that these factors are substantively and strategically interrelated. Generation of political support without program models to fill consequent requests is counterproductive; promotion of educators' interest in art education without the concomitant political support or programmatic development can only breed frustration. Similarly, scholarly commitment to the theoretical and conceptual issues inherent in the arts can be encouraged through any number of incentives, but it will be short-lived if scholars or researchers find little effective audience for their labors. Realization of the goals pursued by the J. P. Getty Trust and other advocates of a discipline-based, sequential art education requires simultaneous attention to strategies for promoting support for change, educational programs, professional development, and the knowledge base necessary to guide and enlighten art education practice.

Appendix

SEVEN COMMON TOPICS FOR DATA COLLECTION

1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CURRICULUM

- To what extent does the program address the three domains? What is the level of programmatic development within each domain?
- What is the level of coherence and continuity within the art program (e.g., across grades, schools, domains) and between art and general education?
- How was the curriculum developed and how is it implemented (number and nature of staff assigned to art education, time and resources allocated to art, facilities available, and the like).
- What means are used to inform teachers regarding the formal curriculum, to provide support, to provide in-service education, and to assure adherence to the specified curriculum?
- In comparison with other academic areas, what is the status of art education in the district?
- How and to what extent does the art program utilize community art resources?

2. CONTENT AND QUALITY

- What are the intellectual, practical, and theoretical roots of the art program?
- What instructional activities constitute each domain?
- What is the character of instruction in studio, history, and criticism (e.g., cursory or comprehensive, integrated or isolated)? What is the effective instructional "weight" (or relative emphasis) of each domain?
- What is the quality of program activities among domains, across schools, among and within grade levels? Causes of unevenness?
- What is the explicit vs. the implicit curriculum? What relationship exists between curriculum (or plans) and instruction? Reasons for disparities.

3. PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- What are program outcomes in each of the domains? What do students learn about and learn to do in areas of studio, history, and criticism?
- What is the quality of outcome in each domain?
- What kinds of beliefs, values, attitudes, etc. about art and involvement in art do teachers, administrators, parents, and students develop as a result of the program?
- Are important unique or unintended outcomes evident? What are they and how did they come about?
- What do students believe to be the value or outcome of their work in art?

4. CONCEPTION OF THE NATURE OF ART

- To what extent do teachers, school officials, and community members believe that art should be central to the school curriculum?
- What is the dominant conception of art evident in the written materials, classroom practices, and the like? How broad is that conception?
- To what extent is art taught in its own right? To what extent is art utilized in the service of other curricular or extracurricular goals?
- Do teachers (or administrators) have a conception of art that they can articulate? If not, what view of art underlies actual classroom practices?
- What is the relationship of popular, commercial, and contemporary arts in the program?

5. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LEARNER AND THE LEARNING PROCESS

- What is the theory of learning implicit or explicit in each domain?
- To what extent is the learning process sequential and integrated within and among grades?
- Is the theory of learning evident in district art education practices consistent with program goals and plans?
- What are learner characteristics: socioeconomic status, ethnicity, cultural background, academic track, and the like?
- What are teacher and administrator expectations of the learner? For example, how much or how little are children seen by teachers and administrators as being able to learn in each of the domains?

6. EVALUATION

- How are student performance and program activities evaluated in each domain? What processes and mechanisms exist for formal and informal assessment of the worth of the entire art curriculum?
- How appropriate or meaningful are the criteria used to assess student outcomes and program activities?
- To what extent is evaluation an integral part of the art education program and program decisionmaking at district, school, and classroom levels?
- Do all three domains receive equal attention in program evaluation activities?
- Is there a process by which the relationships among goals, objectives, teaching strategies, and outcomes are assessed?

7. ORIGINS, STRUCTURAL FEATURES, AND SUPPORT ELEMENTS

- How is the district organized financially, administratively, and instructionally to support art education? What special organizational features, if any, contribute to the well-being of the art program (such as staff development, specialist availability, and the like)?

- What non-school factors, if any, are important to support art education in the district?
- What kinds of personal and professional supports are available to specialist teachers and generalists responsible for art education (campus links, collegial networks, state art education groups, and the like)?
- What is the level of the program's overall institutionalization? Are there differences among the domains? What forms does institutionalization take in the district? What seems most important?
- What is the nature and degree of support for and commitment to art education by the superintendent, school board, central office administrators, teachers, parents, students, and community members? Has this changed over time? If so, why?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barkan, M., "Transition in Art Education: Changing Conceptions of Curricular Content and Teaching," *Art Education*, Vol. 15, No. 7, October 1962, pp. 12–18.

Berman, P., and M. W. McLaughlin, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change: Volume VIII. Implementing and Sustaining Innovations*, The Rand Corporation, R-1598/8-HEW, 1978.

Boyer, E. L., *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America*, Harper and Row, New York, 1983.

Broudy, H. S., "Arts Education: Necessary or Just Nice?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 60, 1979, pp. 347–350.

California State Department of Education, *Visual and Performing Arts*, Sacramento, California, 1982.

Chapman, Laura, *Instant Art, Instant Culture*, Teachers College Press, New York, 1982.

Clifford, G. J., "An Historical Overview of Teaching and Research: Perspectives for Arts and Aesthetics Education," in G. L. Kneiter and J. Stallings (eds.), *The Teaching Process and Arts and Aesthetics*, This Yearbook on Research in Arts and Aesthetic Education, CEMREL, Inc., St. Louis, 1979, pp. 11–49.

College Board, *Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do*, New York, 1983.

Cuban, L., *How Teachers Taught: Consistency and Change in American Classrooms 1890–1980*, Longman, New York, 1984.

Duke, Leilani Lattin, "The Getty Center for Education in the Arts," *Phi Beta Kappan*, May 1984, pp. 612–614.

Eisner, Elliot W. (ed.), *The Arts, Human Development and Education*, McCutchan Publishing Corp., Berkeley, 1976.

Eisner, Elliot W., *Educating Artistic Vision*, Macmillan, New York, 1972.

Fullan, M., *The Meaning of Educational Change*, Teachers College Press, New York, 1982.

Fuller, F. F., and O. Brown, "On Becoming a Teacher," in K. Ryan (ed.), *Teacher Education: The Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (part 2)*, University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Goodlad, J., *A Place Called School*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1984.

Griesemer, J. L., and C. Butler, *Education Under Study: An Analysis of Recent Major Reports on Education*, 2d ed., The Northeast Regional Exchange, Inc., Chelmsford, Massachusetts, November 1983.

Helco, H., "Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment," in A. King (ed.), *The New Political System*, American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C., 1978.

Lieberman, A., and L. Miller, "The Social Realities of Teaching," in A. Lieberman and L. Miller (eds.), *Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*, Teachers College Press, New York, 1979.

McFee, J., and R. Degge, *Art, Culture and Environment: A Catalyst for Teaching*, Wadsworth Publishing Co., Belmont, California, 1977.

Mitchell, D. E., and C. T. Kerchner, "Labor Relations and Teaching Policy," in L. Schulman and G. Sykes (eds.), *Handbook of Teaching and Policy*, Longman, New York, 1982, pp. 214–238.

National Art Education Association, *The Essentials of a Quality School Art Program*, Reston, Virginia, 1968.

Nemser, S. F., "Learning to Teach," in L. Shulman and G. Sykes (eds.), *Handbook of Teaching and Policy*, Longman, New York, 1982, pp. 150–170.

Ohio State Department of Education, *Planning Art Education*, Arthur Elfland (ed.), 1977.

Peters, Thomas J., and Robert H. Waterman, Jr., *In Search of Excellence*, Harper and Row, New York, 1982.

Sarason, S., *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*, 2d ed., Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1982.

Wisconsin State Department of Education, *A Conceptual Approach to Art Curriculum Planning—Guidelines, Grades K-12*, Madison, 1970.